

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1892.

THREE UNIQUE ELIZABETHAN DRAMAS.

I.

THE work of George Gascoigne, the well-known author of 'The Steele Glas,' offers several points of interest to the investigator. Although a man of strong individuality, and for the most part working along well-defined lines, his versatility is his most striking trait. He seemed to feel a premonition of those quickening impulses which were to make the literature of the next two generations the greatest that England has produced, and we find him, so to speak, looking about for the best means and models by which to perpetuate his literary fame. As a result, Gascoigne has left us a larger number of "first attempts" than any other author in the annals of English literature, and the points of his contact with the history of that literature are many and important. This note will deal solely with the three dramas of Gascoigne, which possess this quality in common, that each is a unique example of a distinct species of the drama and the earliest specimen of its class.

We shall begin with a consideration of "Jocasta." This tragedy, which purports to have been "translated [from the Greek of Euripides] and digested into Acts by George Gascoigne and Francis Kinwelmarsh," was presented at Gray's Inn, as we learn by the title, in 1566,¹ and has been recorded by Collier as "the second dramatic performance in our language in blank verse."² "Jocasta" is a version of the "Phoenissae" and was "the first attempt to follow up the classical path opened by Gorboduc."³ As Warton long ago declared:

"It is partly a paraphrase, and partly an abridgement of the Greek tragedy. There are many omissions, retrenchments and transpo-

¹ Langbaine says that "Jocasta" was printed as early as 1556 in quarto. This is probably a mistake. See 'Dramatic Poets,' ed. 1691, p. 231.

² 'Hist. of Dramatic Poetry,' iii, pp. 6-11 and Warton, 'Hist. of Engl. Poetry,' iii, p. 70.

³ Herford, 'The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth century,' p. 150.

sitions, [although] the chorus, the characters and the substance of the story are entirely retained and the tenor of the dialogue is often preserved through whole scenes."⁴

Warton devotes considerable space to a comparison of Gascoigne's paraphrase with a literal translation of the "Phoenissae," and concludes that

"Our translators thought the many mythological and historical allusions in the Greek chorus too remote and unintelligible to be exhibited in English."⁵

This points to a scholarly and intelligent attempt on the part of the joint authors to adapt the Greek drama to the exigencies of an English performance, and Gascoigne has accordingly been credited by Collier with "the first-known attempt to introduce a Greek play upon the English stage."⁶

Now, from Gascoigne's own words we must infer that his knowledge of Greek was extremely limited,⁷ and we cannot but feel surprised at the selection of the "Phoenissae" for translation, and that so serious an attempt as the reproduction of a Greek tragedy in English should have been made so early in the history of our drama. On consulting Prof. Mahaffy, we learn that "no piece of Euripides has been more frequently copied and quoted than the Phoenissae."⁸ To say nothing of the modern versions of Racine, Schiller and Alfieri, there were parodies by Aristophanes, Strattis and Novius, and a free translation by Attius. The "Thebais" of Statius is on the same subject as is the "Thebaid" of Seneca, which is a compound of "the fragments of an Oedipus at Colonus and a Phoenissae."⁹ Before Gascoigne's play there was probably at least one French version, and Lodovico Dolce's "Giocasta," which the author describes as *gia di Euripide invenzione et hora nuova parto mio*, had appeared in 1549.¹⁰ Of the nature of Dolce's play I can not speak at first hand; but there is no reason to believe that it differs materially from the bulk of its class. In the words of Mr. J. A. Symonds:

⁴ Warton, p. 302. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 304. ⁶ 'Hist. of Dram. Poetry,' iii, p. 8. ⁷ 'Adventures of Master Ferdinando Ieronimi,' Hazl. ed. i, p. 429. ⁸ 'Hist. of Classical Greek Lit.,' i, p. 364. ⁹ 'Sh's Predecessors in the English Drama' by J. A. Symonds, p. 218.

¹⁰ Dolce's "Giocasta" is reprinted in vol. vi of the 'Teatro Antico Italiano.'

"Every tragic scene which the Italians of the Renaissance set forth upon the board of Rome or Florence or Ferrara was a transcript of Seneca. Following this lead our English scholars went to school with Seneca beneath the ferule of Italian ushers."¹¹

During the earliest years of the reign of Elizabeth the popularity of Seneca was unexampled. Between 1559 and 1566 several English authors translated him,¹² among them Gascoigne's intimate, Alexander Nevile, whose version of "Ædipus" was written in 1560, although not printed until 1581.¹³ The "Thebais" itself was translated by Thomas Newton but probably too late to have had any effect upon Gascoigne's work.¹⁴

In the midst of so strong a Senecan and Italian influence, we are not surprised to learn that Gascoigne's version of Euripides is a literal translation of Dolce's Italian version of Seneca's imitation of the "Phoenissae"; and that only "the choral odes are in part original."¹⁵ Besides the closeness of the English play to its Italian original, for which I must take the word of Prof. Mahaffy and Mr. Symonds,¹⁶ both have called attention to the fact that the *paidagogos* or "gouverneur to the Queenes sonnes" is called *Bailo* in Gascoigne's play, the regular Venetian title for a tutor, and the word used by Dolce.¹⁷

This is not the place in which to expatiate on the Senecan drama, a dreary exotic happily incapable of acclimatization in English soil. "Jocasta" exhibits all the leading features of its species: "dissertation, reflective diatribes and lengthy choruses." From "Gorboduc" is derived its medium of expression, blank verse, and the dumb shows which precede each act. It is worthy of note that the dumb shows, which were the device by which the want of action in "Gorboduc" was remedied,

are not so needful in "Jocasta," which is fuller of event. The versification, in which Gascoigne's work is not especially distinguishable from that of his coadjutor, is smooth, the lines prevailing end-stopped, and characterized by much regularity. While the derivation of the tragedy forbids any criticism of the plot or its conduct, we feel that the characters are at least as distinguishable as those of "Gorboduc" and that Prof. Mahaffy's estimate of "Jocasta" as "a motly and incongruous piece" is perhaps unnecessarily harsh.

For the sake of comparison, I shall quote the following short passage from Euripides and from Gascoigne. It has often been compared with a speech of Hotspur's (also quoted below), which Professor Mahaffy considers Shakespeare's "only direct obligation to Greek tragedy."¹⁸

Ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐδὲν, μήτερ, ἀποκρύψας ἔρῳ
ἄστρων ἂν ἔλθοιμ' αἰθέρος πρὸς ἀντολὰς
καὶ γῆς ἐνερθε, δυνατὸς ὦν δρᾶσαι τὰδε,
τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὄστ' ἔχειν τυραννίδα.¹⁹

"To say the truth (mother) this mind of mine
Doth fleet full farre from that farfetch of his,
Ne will I longer cover my conceit:
If I could rule or reign in heaven above,
And eke commaund in depth of darksome hell,
No toil ne trauell should my spirit abashe
To take the way unto my restlesse will."²⁰

It need scarcely be premised that the following never came to Shakespeare through Gascoigne.

"By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap
To pluck bright Honor from the pale-faced moon,
Or dive into the bottom of the deep
Where fathom-line could never touch the ground,
And pluck up drowned Honor by the locks;
So he that doth redeem her hence might wear
Without corival all her dignities."²¹

The following parallel may be noted as a matter of minor interest. In the dumb show which precedes the first act of "Jocasta," we find these stage directions: "Enter a king with an imperial crown upon his head very richly apparelled, etc., sitting in a Chariote very richly furnished, drawne in by foure kinges in their Dublettes and Hosen, etc."²² Did Marlowe have this passage in mind in the

¹¹ 'Sh's Predecessors in the Engl. Drama,' p. 217.

¹² Warton mentions the fragment of a translation of "Hercules Oetaeus" as preserved among the Cotton MSS. in the Bodleian Library by no less a hand than Elizabeth's, about 1561. 'Hist. of Engl. Poetry,' iii, p. 318.

¹³ Warton, 'Hist. of Engl. Poetry,' iii, pp. 311-12.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 315; also see Morley's 'First Sketch of Engl. Lit.' pp. 327-28.

¹⁵ Ward, 'Hist. of Engl. Dramatic Lit.,' i, p. 114.

¹⁶ 'Hist. of Classical Greek Lit.,' i, pp. 165-6; and 'Sh's Predecessors in the Engl. Drama,' pp. 221-22.

¹⁷ See "Jocasta," Hazl. i, p. 258, and Dolce's "Giocasta," as above.

¹⁸ 'Hist. of Classical Greek Lit.,' i, p. 366 note.

¹⁹ "Phoenissae," 503-506. ²⁰ "Jocasta," 2, 1, Hazl. ed. i, p. 287. ²¹ "Hen. IV.," 1, 3, 201. ²² Hazl. ed. i, p. 259.

stage direction: "Enter Tamburlaine drawn in his chariot by the kings of Trebezond and Soria, with bits in their mouths: in his right hand a whip with which he scourgeth them?"²³ Or did both look back to a common original?

II.

Gascoigne's comedy the "Supposes" was performed the same year as "Jocasta," 1566, and at the same place. None of the particulars of these two performances have been handed down to us. However, that the "Supposes" was not unsuccessful is proved by its revival in 1582 at Trinity College, Oxford.²⁴ This play is particularly memorable as the first successful adaptation of an Italian comedy, "the earliest existing specimen of a play in English prose acted either in public or private,"²⁵ and from the fact that from it Shakespeare borrowed the underplot of "The Taming of the Shrew." "It seems peculiarly fitting," says Mr. Symonds, "that our comedy should have begun with a translation of Ariosto's *Suppositi*," which with the same author's "Cassaria" are placed next to the comedies of Macchiavelli by most Italian critics; for Ariosto seems to have been the first who conceived and carried into effect the idea of regular comedies in imitation of the ancients.²⁶

In the "*Suppositi*," says Ginguéné, "his second comedy, Ariosto imitates chiefly the 'Captivi' of Plautus and the 'Eunuchus' of Terence";²⁷ and Ward commends the "free imitation of the manner" of the former, the "spirited and natural dialogue" and the graceful spontaneity of Ariosto's flow of language.²⁸

The "Supposes" holds an important place in the early history of English drama; for just as "Ralph Roister Doister" represents the direct contact with classical comedy and "Gammer Gurton's Needle" the emergence of the native comedy from the slough of the formless interlude, the "Supposes" stands as representative of that Italian influence which

²³ Part II, 4, 4.

²⁴ Collier, 'Hist. of Engl. Dramatic Poetry,' iii, p. 6-11.

²⁵ *Ibid.* ²⁶ 'Studies in South Europe,' i, p. 109. See also Hallam 'Lit. of Europe,' i, p. 275, and Ginguéné, 'Hist. Litt. d'Italie' ed. Milan 1820, vi, *passim*. ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 180 seqq., where a synopsis of the play will be found. ²⁸ 'Hist. Engl. Dram. Lit.' i, p. 144.

in fuller flood was to become the source of the English Romantic comedy. As is well-known, Ariosto's comedy was first written in prose and afterwards rewritten in *versi sdruccioli* or endecasyllabic blank verse in supposed imitation of the ancients.²⁹ It is the opinion of Collier that Gascoigne took his translation from Ariosto's earlier prose version, but that he adopted some of the changes which Ariosto had introduced when he turned the play into verse. The critic concludes; "Gascoigne has added very little of his own."³⁰

If Gascoigne had the example of Sackville in his adoption of blank verse for tragedy, he certainly appears to have been the first to conceive the practicability of writing comic prose dialogue in English. The innovation of prose as the medium of comedy cannot but be regarded one of the most important steps in the history of the drama; and Gascoigne's use of sprightly prose dialogue in this place closely approaches the excellence of his successor, John Lyly.

Of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Gascoigne, Dr. Hunter speaks as follows:

"One of the most interesting circumstances about this play is that when Shakespeare in the fourth act introduces an incident which is not in the old play, he takes it from Ariosto's comedy entitled *I Suppositi*, as translated by Gascoigne.³¹ . . . My young master and his man exchange habits and characters, and persuade a Scenese, as he is called, to personate the father, exactly as in 'The Taming of the Shrew,' by the pretended danger of his coming from Sienna to Ferrara, contrary to the order of the government."³²

A very careful comparison of the two plays proves more than this, as the whole of Lucentio's subterfuge to obtain his mistress seems borrowed from the "Supposes." There is a similar entanglement in "The Taming of a Shrew," but there the exchange of characters between master and man (Aurelius and Valeria) serves no very coherent purpose, and the impersonation of the father is introduced by no such clever trick as that practised on the Scenese and the pedant of Mantua in the "Supposes" and "The Taming of the Shrew" respectively. In the "Supposes," Erostrato,

²⁹ Ginguéné, vi, p. 170.

³⁰ 'Hist. of Engl. Dram. Poetry,' iii, pp. 6 and 7.

³¹ 'New Illustr. of Sh.,' i, p. 352.

³² Farmer 'On the Learning of Sh.,' Malone's 'Sh.,' i, p. 341.

the lover, becomes a servant in the house of his mistress' father, whilst his servant Dulipo impersonates him. In the play attributed to Shakespeare this episode has been alike developed and condensed, by making the lover, Lucentio, become the daughter's tutor. The charming scenes between the lovers, with the duplication of the device in Hortensio, have no counterpart in the 'Supposes.'

Hunter continues:

"The resemblance between certain portions of 'The Taming of the Shrew' and the 'Supposes' of Gascoigne was pointed out first, I believe, by Dr. Farmer, who observes that it was from the 'Supposes' that he [Shakespeare] got the name Petruchio,³³ which he substituted for Ferando, the name of the corresponding character in the old play."³⁴

Mr. Malone adds that it was there also that he found the name of Licio.³⁵ Then comes Tyrwhitt, who suggests that the word supposes in the line:

While counterfeit supposes bleared thine eyne—
is in allusion to the title of Gascoigne's play."³⁶

III.

"The Glasse of Government," Gascoigne's third drama,

"A tragicall comedie so entituled, bycause therein are handled aswell the rewardes of Vertue, as also the punishment of Vices," was published in 1575.³⁷ This play belongs to the 'School-drama,' one of the forms of that wider cycle, "The Prodigal Son." Gascoigne's is the sole representative of this curious class in the history of English literature, although an examination of the writers of Latin comedy in Germany during the sixteenth century discloses more than a score of versions of this popular parabole.³⁸ Mr. Hazlitt confesses

³³ Petrucio occurs as the name of one of the Scenese's servants in the "Supposes." See Hazlitt's 'Gascoigne,' i, p. 199.

³⁴ 'On the Learning of Sh.,' Malone's 'Sh.,' i, p. 346.

³⁵ This name appears in the "Supposes" as Lytio, servant to Philogano. Lucio is one of the guests of Capulet. "R. and J." I, ii. Cf. further the nurse of the "Supposes" and of "R. and J."

³⁶ See Malone's 'Sh.,' 'The Taming of the Shrew,' V, i, 120, where Tyrwhitt is quoted.

³⁷ Arber is evidently wrong in assigning 1565 as the date of the dedication of this play. See his ed. of 'The Steele Glas,' Chronicle, p. 4.

³⁸ Cf. Holstein's 'Das Drama vom Verlorenen Sohn,' 1880.

his inability to name Gascoigne's model and correctly declaring the style and construction as both un-English, suggests that "some of the incidents are in the manner of the early Latin dramatists."³⁹ Fortunately Mr. C. H. Herford, in his 'Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany,' has worked up the subject of the 'School-drama,' and thrown a flood of light upon this play and its originals. It remains for me to avail myself of Mr. Herford's interesting researches and here to acknowledge my debt to him.⁴⁰

Mr. Herford begins by noting two peculiarities in Gascoigne's use of the Roman situations:

"There is an obvious attempt (1) to combine with them a pronounced Christian moral; and (2) to associate them with the life of a modern university."

Then follows a *résumé* of the dramatic versions of the parable of the Prodigal Son in Germany from Macropedius' "Asotus," 1510, and Gnapheus' "Acolastus," 1529, to Stymmelius', "Studentes," 1549. Mr. Herford dwells on the great popularity of several of these plays and the number of editions through which both the "Acolastus" and the "Studentes" ran, thus leaving little doubt of the European celebrity of both plays. He adds that "all three dramatists must have been well known, at least by name and reputation, in the University circles to which Gascoigne belonged"; and calls attention to Gascoigne's presence in Holland, the actual scene of several of these plays. As further evidence Mr. Herford writes as follows:—

"Some parts of the plot, for instance the episode of the Markgrave, show familiarity with its [Antwerp's] institutions, and the figure of Eccho, a gay fellow 'known to all the town,' has something of the air of a portrait. Gascoigne's attested knowledge of Dutch itself involved a certain acquaintance with Dutch society and its current literature.

The external evidence then rather favors the view that Gascoigne was not a stranger to works connected by so close an affinity with his own. . . . Distinct copy of any one of them of course it is not; it is written throughout with a different bias; it is the work of a Calvinist, not a Catholic, or of a Lutheran; it is in the vernacular, not in Latin; in prose, not

³⁹ Hazlitt's 'Gascoigne,' ii, p. 347.

⁴⁰ For a synopsis of this play, see Herford, p. 150.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 152. ⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 152-158.

in verse. For all that, however, it assuredly belongs to the same dramatic cycle; it is an attempt, that is, to connect *Terentian situation* with a *Christian moral* in a picture of *school-life*.⁴³

Then follows a detailed examination of the relation of "The Glasse of Government" to the three plays mentioned, for which the reader must be referred to Mr. Herford's own words; this is his conclusion:

"There are plausible grounds for supposing that one of the most respectable pioneers of the great age of the English drama stood for a moment in literary contact with the most original Latin dramatists of the previous generation; that he met with their writings either in England, where they were in any case known by repute, or during the Dutch journey which immediately preceded the writing of his own play; and that he learned from them what no Roman or English dramatist could then have taught him,—the idea of a 'Glass of Government' in which the unsavory world of Roman comedy is boldly adopted with a Christian purpose, while the story of the biblical Prodigal is worked out, much enlarged and still more extensively 'amended,' in the sphere of the modern school."⁴⁴

There remains little to add. Mr. Herford has pointed out Thomas Ingledand's "The Disobedient Child" as the only other English version of the Prodigal Son, and called attention to a more distant parallel in Woode's "Conflict of Conscience."⁴⁵ Possibly considering the manner in which the theme of repentance is set aside in "The Glasse of Government" for that of a contrast between a virtuous and a vicious life in the young, the more familiar drama "Eastward Ho!" may offer as distinct a parallel.⁴⁶ The general theme finally received a vivid pictorial treatment at the hands of Hogarth in his series of 'pictured morals,' entitled 'Industry and Idleness.'⁴⁷

Aside from its origin and unique position in English literature, "The Glasse of Government" is really a remarkable play; excellent, if over regular in construction, rapid and logical in its movement, and clear in character-drawing. It is pervaded by the same sincere moral tone which has given "The Steele Glas" its popularity, but, barring the lengthy dis-

courses of Gnomaticus, is rarely inartistic. The comedy scenes are characterized by much lightness of touch and fidelity to nature, and the dialogue is worthy the translator of "I Suppositi."

In Gascoigne's day the drama was not yet out of foreign leading-strings, and the paths of Seneca, of Ariosto or of Plautus and Terence were the only paths in which its infant feet could tread. The dramatic career of Gascoigne is especially interesting from his varied choice of models; though not yet strong enough to stand alone, he sought for final independence through many guides. In the next generation Gascoigne would have been a great dramatist, as much beyond his actual achievements as these achievements are above these of his friend, Whetstone. As it is, he is memorable for the earliest specimen of a tragedy in English founded, however remotely, on a Greek original, the earliest existing specimen of an English comedy in prose, and the only example of the "School-drama" in the vernacular of England.

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

NOTES ON MORRIS AND SKEAT'S 'SPECIMENS OF EARLY ENGLISH.'

In Vols. i and ii of MOD. LANG. NOTES, were some excellent notes and emendations by Prof. Egge, which I trust will have due weight with the compilers when preparing a new edition. But in going through these volumes I have added a number of other corrections and suggestions, a part of which I here submit for consideration.

Vol. i, p. 3, l. 37, *wene we*. This is a question: 'May we at all call him mother, do we think? Yea we may.' Prof. Egge's surprise that the compilers have uselessly increased the difficulties of the text by reproducing the eccentric punctuation of the MSS., is shared, I should think, by most teachers.

P. 5. l. 121, *sorize and gelice dead*. The context shows that we should read *grislice*, instead of the unmeaning *gelice*. L. 127. The interpolated *and* is superfluous. 'As our Saviour instructed them, they taught many things.'

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 159-160. ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

⁴⁵ The plays are reprinted in Hazlitt's 'Dodsley,' vols. ii and vi. ⁴⁶ Cunningham's 'Chapman,' Plays, p. 450 seqq.

⁴⁷ 'A set of Twelve Plates,' published in 1747.

P. 10, l. 125, *Bryniges*. The note seems absurd. Why should they hang coats-of-mail on their victims' feet, when stones or other weights would answer the purpose? Thorpe's reading, 'fires,' is much more plausible.

P. 12, l. 79, *he wan . . . lx sol. of Alde-wingle*. The glossary translates *sol.*, 'shillings,' and this necessitates the violent interpolation of *alc gær*. I should read *solidatas* 'solidates.' 'Solidata terrae. Modus agri ad valorem unius solidi. "quinque solidatas terrae in Beverstona."' Du Cange, s. v.

P. 101, l. 64, *Hire feader feng on earst feire on, to lokin gef he mahte wið eani lue speden*. The note translates, 'began first fairly [kindly] to look upon her.' It is, 'began first fairly [kindly], to see if he might succeed,' etc.

P. 116, l. 162, *Schriſtes leane* does not mean 'confessor's leave,' but 'leave of confession,' that is, leave given in confession. Confessor, in the A. R., is *schriſtfeder*.

P. 119, l. 260, *istihd* does not mean 'stitched' but 'adjusted;' from *stihlen*, not from *stician*. 'Let their collars be adjusted high.'

P. 143, l. 55, *Stor signefied gode werkes*. Here is probably an error in the MS., and for *werkes* we should read *biddinge*. The homilist is, as usual, expounding mystic meanings; and the context makes it abundantly clear that he took the gold to typify faith, the frankincense prayer, and the myrrh good works.

P. 230, l. 574, *Havelok*, in great peril, laments *that him ne hauede grip or ern . . . that wolde him dere*. Instead of *dere* (injure) I should like to read *nere* (deliver), if I could find the word so late in use. The deliverance of innocents by the intervention of friendly griffins or lions was a common incident in romance.

P. 279, l. 1053. The editor has arbitrarily transposed two lines from their right places. The palmer is explaining why he could not enter the palace. The gates were shut because it was bed-time, and 'Modi had ordered that she [the bride] should be led to her chamber.'

Vol. ii, p. 9, l. 243. Malcolm marries Margaret *as is wille to [him] com*. The *him* is an interpolation of the editor. I should prefer *hire*.

P. 24, l. 19, *pou vnderlaide alle pinges Vnder his fete pat ought forthbringes*. The translation in the note is wrong: it is, 'thou hast put under his feet all things that bring forth anything;' that is, all animals.

P. 49, l. 29. *Hoc* is a pruning-hook, not 'a scythe.'

P. 104, l. 184. *Hy byep glede of god onzyg-inde*. The note translates *onzyg-inde*, 'invisible;' but it is 'unspeakably' (from *zigge*); the *laetitia inenarrabilis* of the Vulgate.

P. 142, l. 125, *pe quene . . . as a mix pougt*. This *mix*, from *meox*, 'filth,' and used for 'vile woman,' is perhaps the origin of 'minx.'

P. 195, l. 70. Envy attributes the acidity of his stomach to *venim*, or *vernisch* or *vinegre*. The glossary translates *vernisch*, 'varnish,' which is not reasonable. It is probably *vernage*, a white acid wine. Cf. 'Awntyrs of Arthure,' l. 36; 'vernage in verrys and cowpys.' Until evidence is produced, I shall doubt the existence of varnish in the fourteenth century.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

A LITERARY MOTIVE COMMON TO OLD, MIDDLE, AND MODERN ENGLISH.

THERE are three poems of very different date which contain the same literary motive. These poems are the Old English 'Christ,' the Middle English 'Cursor Mundi,' and the Modern English 'The love of Christ which passeth knowledge;' the last-named being by Christina Rossetti, and published by her in her 'Goblin Market, and other Poems,' pp. 133-4. The common literary motive is an address of Christ to the individual sinner, in which appeal is made to the sufferings of the Saviour as a ground for requital by a corresponding love. In each, as is natural, the appeal is pathetic and moving. The similarities between these exhortations point to a common source for the motive. This I have not succeeded in discovering, and I, therefore, present the parallels to other students in the hope that they may be more fortunate.

The circumstances under which the sinner

is addressed are different in the three cases. In the 'Christ' it is the whole body of the condemned who are reminded of Christ's sufferings, and their rejection of the proffered mercy, as the ground of the condemnation which is to follow. The passage in question extends from l. 1380 to l. 1515, inclusive, but I quote only 1440 to 1469, and 1488 to 1497:

*ponne ic fore folce onfeng fēonda genīðlan,
fylgdon me mid firenum, fēhðe ne rôhtun,
and mid sweopum slôgun. Ic þæt sár for þe
purh ēaðmēdu eall gēpolade,
hosp and heardcwide, þā hī hwæsne bēag
ymb min hēafod heardne gebýgdon,
prēam biþrycton, se wæs of þornum geworht.
þā ic wæs áhongen on hēahne bēam
rôde gefæstnad, þā hī ricene mid spere
of minre sídan swát út guton,
dréor tó foldan, þæt þú of deofles purh þæt
nýdgewalde genered wurde.
þā ic womma léas wite polade,
ýfel earfeðu, ððæt ic áne forlét
of minum lichoman tǽsgende gæst.
Geséoð nú þā feorhdolg, þe gefremedon ær
on minum folmum and on fótum swá some,
purh þā ic hongade hearde gefæstnad:
meaht hēr tæc geséon orgete nú gēn
on minre sídan swátge wunde.
Hú þær wæs unesen racu unc gemæne!
ic onfeng þin sár, þæt þú mōste gesælig mines
ēðelrices ēadig nēotan,
and þe mine deaðe deore gebohte
þæt longe lif, þæt þú on léohte siððan
wlitig womma léas wunian mōstes;
læg min flēschoma in foldan bigrafen
niðre gehýded, se þe nēngum scód,
in byrgenne, þæt þú meahte beorhte uppe
on roderum wesan rice mid englum.
Forhwon áhenge þú mé hefgor on þinra honda
róde,
ponne þu hongade? Hwæt! mé þeos heardre
þynceð:
nú is swærrē mid mec þinra synna ród,
þe ic unwillum on bēom gefæstnad,
ponne seo ððer wæs, þe ic ær gestág
willum minum, þā mec þin wēa swiðast
æt heortan gehréaw, þā ic þec from helle
átæah,
þær þú hit wolde sylfa siððan gehealdan.*

*Ic wæs on worulde wædla, þæt þú wurde
welig on heofonum;
earm ic wæs on ēðle þinum, þæt þú wurde
ēadig on minum.*

In the 'Cursor Mundi' it follows upon the account of the crucifixion, occupying lines 17111 to 17270. The Fairfax and Trinity MSS. do not have it, but the Cotton and Göttingen MSS. do. Our text is from the Cotton MS., and is an excerpt comprising only lines 17111 to 17178, inclusive. Here it forms part of a dialogue between Christ and Man:

*Iesus o maria born
For sinful man þat was for-lorn
I forsok mi fader blis,
And com in-til erth, i-wis.
I lete me tak and herd bind
For lue i had to mans kind,
I thold pouerd, pine, and scape,
Al for sinful mans name.
Thinc, ai thinc, ai sinful man,
þou thinc on iesu, þi lemman.
I stode naked als i was born
þe wicked Iuus þaim bi-forn,
Bunden til a piler fast,
To-quils þe bandes moght last;
On mi back i bar þe rode,
Quen i unto mi ded yode,
Had neuer man sa mikel scam
In erth for nakins blan.
þou sinful man þat gas bi me,
Duel a quile and þou mai se,
Duell a quile and fond to stan,
Bi-hald mi fote, bi-hald mi hand!
Mi bodi es wit scourges suongen,
Brest, and hand, and fote thurghstungen.
I hing apon þis herd rode,
For þe i gaf mi hert blode;
þe thornnes o mi hede standes,
Thirled am i, fete and handes.
Bi-hald and se mi blodi side,
þat for þi lue es opend wide;
Put in and grappe, mi suet freind,
Tak ute mi hert bituix pine hend;
þan mai þou wit pine eien se
Hu treuli man i lued þe.
Fra mi crun unto mi ta
Ful i am o pine and wa;
Bituix tua theifs hing i here*

*Als i theif and traitur wer,
 Befor mi moder eien, mare,
 Sufferd i al pis wilani.
 I haf þus mani blodi wondes,
 And sufferd her pis herd stondes,
 And ded on pis rode tre,
 þou sinful man! for luue o þe.
 Sin i haf þe sua dere boght,
 Quat ailes þe þou luues me noght?
 Wit þi sin þou pines me,
 Als did þe luus on rode tre.¹
 þou sinful man! if þou cuth god,
 Oft bird þe thinc a-pon mi blod
 Night and dai, and al þe time,
 Wel bird þe thinc a-pon mi pine.
 Waila wai! þou sinful man,
 Ne haf i mad þe mi lemman,
 Ne haf i gin þe al mi blis,
 And mi-self þar-wit, i-wiss,
 If þou neuer sa nobul war;
 Quat thing moght i giue þe mare?
 I wat neuer o nakins wise.
 þan bird þe thinc ai to rise,
 Suith to rise and faand to blin,
 And for mi luue for-sak þi sin.
 For-sak þi sin þur charite,
 And faand to rise, and com to me!
 I sal þe hals, i sal þe kiss,
 And bring þe to mi fader blis.*

The third, Miss Rossetti's poem, appears as a lyric, with nothing to show that its original or model formed part of a larger whole:

I bore with thee long weary days and nights,
 Through many pangs of heart, through many tears;
 I bore with thee, thy hardness, coldness, slights,
 For three and thirty years.

Who else had dared for thee what I have dared?
 I plunged the depth most deep from bliss above;

I not My flesh, I not My spirit spared:
 Give thou Me love for love.

For thee I thirsted in the daily drouth,
 For thee I trembled in the nightly frost:
 Much sweeter thou than honey to My mouth:
 Why wilt thou still be lost?

1. At this point in the Göttingen MS occur these two additional lines:

*wid athes grete and wick dede,
 oft þu geris mi wondis blede.*

I bore thee on My shoulders and rejoiced:
 Men only marked upon My shoulders borne
 The branding cross; and shouted hungry-voiced,
 Or wagged their heads in scorn.

Thee did nails grave upon My hands, thy name
 Did thorns for frontlets stamp between Mine eyes:

I, Holy One, put on thy guilt and shame;
 I, God, Priest, Sacrifice.

A thief upon My right hand and My left;
 Six hours alone, athirst, in misery:
 At length in death one smote My heart and cleft
 A hiding-place for thee.

Nailed to the racking cross, than bed of down
 More dear, whereon to stretch Myself and sleep:

So did I win a kingdom,—share My crown;
 A harvest,—come and reap.

If it were certain that these should be brought into relation with passages in the English Mystery Plays, perhaps a clue might be secured. I refer to such parts as the speech of Christ in the York Play of the Crucifixion, p. 357:

*Al men þat walkis by waye or strete,
 Takes tente ge schalle no trauayle tyne,
 By-holdest myn heede, myn handis, and my feete,
 And fully feele nowe or ge fyne,
 Yf any mourning may be meete
 Or myscheue mesured vnto myne.*

Or to the beginning of the 'Harrowing of Hell' in the same cycle, p. 372:

*Manne on molde, be meke to me,
 And haue thy maker in þi mynde,
 And thynke howe I haue tholid for þe,
 With pereles paynes for to be pynd.*

Or, finally, to the first lines of the 'Harrowing of Hell' in the Towneley Mysteries ('York Plays,' p. 372):

*My fader me from blis has send
 Tille erth for mankynde sake,
 Adam mys for to amend,
 My deth nede must I take.*

*I dwellyd ther thyrt yeres and two
And somdele more, the sothe to say,
In anger, pyne, and mekylle wo,
I dyde on cros this day.*

See also the 'Harrowing of Hell' (from MS. Harl. 2253), lines 43-58; Towneley Mysteries, 'Judithium,' following the words, *Tunc expandit manus suas et ostendit eis vulnera sua*, pp. 315-316 of the Surtees Society Edition; and especially the Towneley 'Resurrectio Domini,' pp. 259-261 (cf. Chester Plays, ed. Wright, pp. 89-90).

The passage from the Crucifixion Play seems to be based on Lamentations .i, 12. Is it possible that this verse, from a chapter anciently much used as a Scripture lesson in Passion Week (cf., for example, Mone, 'Schauspiele des Mittelalters,' p. 204), may be the germ of the longer addresses?

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD IN THE PATOIS OF CACHY (Somme).

THE Latin verb in its development into the Neo-Latin suffered a diminution in the number of its tenses. This diminution has been greater in the language of the peasant than in the literary language. The literary language adhered to the Latin usage in the sequence of tenses. The language of the peasant is less accurate in its distinctions and makes a present tense serve as a past and a past tense as a present.

In the patois of Cachy the present subjunctive of the verbs HABERE and ESSERE has been lost, and the Latin pluperfect is used as a present subjunctive:—

k'z'üš	k'z'füş
k't'üš	k'tü füş
k'il üš	k'i'füş
k'oz üšōš	k'o füşōš
k'oz üšēš	k'o füşēš
k'iz üšt.	k'i füşt.

In O. Picard both the present and imperfect subjunctive of these verbs existed.¹

One of the peculiarities of the conjugation of

¹ De Wailly, "Observations grammaticales sur les Chartes françaises d'Aire": *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, xxxii, 306.

verbs in the patois of Cachy is the termination -š for all verbs in the present subjunctive. It is found in this tense in the O. Picard, although its use is not general. There are only two cases of it in the third person singular of the works examined by De Wailly: *lievreche* (K. 7); *fache* (J. 99). No example is noted by Krull in 'Guy de Cambrai.' In De Wailly's *chartes* this ending is also found for the first person of the pres. indic.: *fache* (J. 99); *mech* (E. 21); *faich* (C. 2); but also *fai* (E. 1.) and *met* (M. 84), and, on account of the last two forms, De Wailly thinks the *ch* was mute in the first three. From verbs such as these it went over to all verbs, and spread through all persons of the present subjunctive. In the 'Célèbre Mariage' (seventeenth century) this form is general in that tense: *soz euchié chi esté* (5); *pour eq j'el croiche* (Crinon, Sat., i, 7); *qu'i feut qu'j'el voiche* (*ibid.*, i, 8); *faura qu'chaquein . . . meuche sin blé* (*ibid.*, i, 30).

Raynaud's theory with regard to the *ch* is, that in the subjunctive, as in the indicative, the verbs of the first conjugation were assimilated to those from the second and fourth Latin conjugations in -EO and IO, and the sibilant was produced by the yod of these terminations. Hence *porš*, pres. subj. of *porti* represents a Latin type *PORTIAM.² The theory of Suchier is that *ch* in the first person sing. of the pres. indic., which is found in the early texts only after *t* (DEFENDO > *defench*; MITTO > *mech*; ARDIO > *arch*; SENTIO > *sench*) arose from the necessity of distinguishing the first person from the third person in which the *t* was still pronounced.³ He also believes that the -*ch* went into the subjunctive from the first person singular of the pres. indic.⁴

The present state of the patois is an argument against the first part of Suchier's theory that the *ch* was introduced into the first person to differentiate it from the third person. For, granting for the moment that the subjunctive has taken the *ch* from analogy with the indicative, it has been taken into all three persons of the singular of the subjunctive, so that no need of the differentiation of these persons seems to be felt. Why then should it have been felt in the indicative? The early docu-

² *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, xxxvii, 349.

³ Gröber's 'Grundriss,' i, 608.

⁴ *ibid.*, i, 618.

ments in Picard show that this *ch* never had any great currency in the indicative. Hence there is small probability that it had strength enough to establish the type for the subjunctive.

I believe the origin of this *ch* is an entirely different one from that suggested by Raynaud and Suchier. In Picard, Latin *c+i* and *c+e* passed through the stages *kj*, *tj*, *tʃ*, and *t+i* through the stage *tj>tʃ*; the *tʃ* stage is the one which we find in 'Aucassin et Nicolète.' Final *tʃ* of the O. Pic. has gone on to *ʃ* in modern Picard. Hence each of these terminations has given -*ʃ* in the modern patois. This -*ʃ* first arose in the subjunctive in those verbs which, in the Latin had in the pres.

subj. the ending *CI*, *TI*, *CE*. The form *fache* (*FACIAM*) is one of those found by De Wailly.⁵ From this class of verbs it spread to all others.

In the forms of the present subjunctive from *ESSERE* and *HABERE* given above, there is a crossing of the present with the imperfect subjunctive. The O. Pic. stem of the imperfect subj. is combined with the termination of the pres. subj. to form a new pres. subjunctive.

No preterit tense exists in this patois, and the imperfect and present perfect supply its place. The pluperfect takes the place of the past anterior which is not in use.

T. LOGIE.

Williams College.

THE BATTLE OF MALDON.*

He ordered then each warrior-youth to let his charger go,
To drive him far afield, and forward march against the foe,
Relying on his strong right arm and on his courage good.
Then Offa's kinsman truly for the first time understood
The earl would never cowardice endure nor pass it by;
So from his hand into the wood his falcon he let fly,
And to the battle stepped; from this, the youth, as one might know,
At war would never weaken when his hand had strung the bow.
With him, Eadric wished to aid in fight his lord and king,
Made ready to the battle-field his ready spear to bring;
He had a good stout mind, the while his good stout hand could wield
With equal skill in battle-play the broad sword and the shield.
And he, that day, bore out his boast, made good his solemn word
That he would fight upon the field before his king and lord.
Then Byrhtnoð, riding up and down, began to range his band,
To cheer his men and teach them how as warriors they should stand,
Should keep their place; and boldly then he counseled them and bade
That they should firmly hold their shields and never be afraid.
When he had well arrayed his ranks, he reached a little group,
Dismounted where he saw them stand, his own most dear hearth-troop.

The vikings' herald sharply called, he stood upon the shore,
And to the earl the pirates' message boastingly he bore:
"They send and bid me say to thee, a troop of seamen bold,
That thou must quickly send to them, for thy protection, gold;
And that ye buy off this attack, for you is better far
Than that we both together share the cruelties of war.
No need for us to kill if ye but haste to this release,
For sake of gold we will confirm with you a lasting peace.
If thou, who art so greatly rich, to this will but agree,
That thou thy people thus redeem and thus thy folk set free,
Pay to the seamen at their choice a fee for sake of peace,

⁵ *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, xxxii, 317.

*Translated from the Old-English.

Receive a treaty at our hands and thus obtain release,
Then with the tribute we at once unto our ships will go,
Stand out to sea, and truly swear to keep the peace with you."

Byrhtnoð then spoke; he grasped his shield, his slender spear he turned;
He answered him—he spoke in words—his words with anger burned:

"And wilt thou hear now, pirate, what this people wish to say?
For tribute they to you will naught but trusty weapons pay—
The poisoned spear, the olden sword, just such as these ye see,
War-trappings which to you, I ween, in war will worthless be.
Go back, O pirate-messenger, proclaim it if thou will,
Say to the folk who sent thee here a fiercer message still;
Tell them that here a noble earl, with all his warrior band,
Stands who will shield and shelter this his home and native land—
My native land, my father's land, the land of Æthelred—
The heathen who have sent thee here shall every one lie dead.
Meseems 'twere too disgraceful to allow you thus to go
With money to your ships, unfought, without a single blow,
Now that ye thus have hither come into our land so far;
Nor shall ye levy tribute thus without a taste of war.
We first must satisfy ourselves in savage battle-play,
With keen sword-edge and sharp spear-point, before we tribute pay."

He ordered then his men to march; their shields aloft they bore,
Until they reached their station there and stood along the shore.
Because of water, neither troop the other troop could reach;
The billows streamed, the flood-tide flowed along the sandy beach;
And, waiting thus with chafing mind, to them it seemed too long
Ere they together thrust their spears in close and clashing throng.
There they beset old Panta's stream, in close array they pressed,
The vanguard of East-Saxons, the spear-troop, and the rest;
Nor could they do each other hurt, nor harm each other there,
Save when some one received his death by shaft-flight through the air.
At length the flood ebbed outward; the pirates eager stood,
The vast array of vikings bold, eager for war and blood.
The hero-leader ordered then the bridge to keep and hold
A warrior who was Wulfstan hight, a warrior battle-bold.
He was the son of Ceola, and brave, with all his race;
And when the foremost, boldest man stepped on the bridge apace,
Brave Wulfstan smote him with his spear, and struck him from his place.
There stood with Wulfstan (that brave man), supporting him amain,
Stood Maccus and Ælfhere there, a most courageous twain.
And from the passage at the ford they fled not nor gave back,
But fastly they protected it against the foe's attack.

When thus the heathen crew perceived the stanch bridge-warders stand,
Dissimulating, then, they dared to make this bold demand:
That we should let them cross the ford, and lead their troops to land!
The earl, moved by his pride, gave land to all that hostile crowd,
And o'er the water cold his men could hear him call aloud:
"And now the way is opened, come you at us fair and close;
And who may hold the battle-field at last God only knows."
And then the war-wolves waded in, they recked not of the stream,

The tribe of vikings trooping westward over Panta came.
 Over the flashing water, high aloft their shields they bore,
 The pirates brought their shining shields unto the hither shore.
 And there against the enemy, just as they came to land,
 All ready for their rough attack, stood Byrhtnoð and his band.
 He ordered them with shields to form a phalanx firm and close,
 And hold it fast with might and main against their savage foes.
 Then was the battle bravely fought upon that bloody field—
 The day was come when doomed men in death must fall and yield.
 The raven circled through the air—a clamor rose on high—
 The eagle carrion-greedy—and on earth there was a cry.

Warriors were hurling their spears hard as iron, their spear-points sharp-
 ground from their hands they let fly,
 And the bows were full busy, each shield caught a spear-head, and fierce was
 the battle-rush, brave men were falling, and warriors on all sides were
 sinking to die.

Then Wulfmær, Byrhtnoð's sister's son, was wounded unto death,
 Hewn down with swords he sank to earth and drew his latest breath.
 But counter-woe was given then unto the pirate horde,
 For I have heard that Edward slew one of them with his sword.
 His stroke was strong, he swung his sword, its swing he did not spare
 Until the warrior at his feet fell doomed and lifeless there.
 For this, the king, his master, whom as chamberlain he served,
 Spoke, when occasion came, the thanks the deed so well deserved.
 So stood they firm and fierce of mind, the warriors at their strife,
 And each sought eagerly how he might soonest take a life—
 The warriors with their weapons sought among the doomed men
 Who there could first, with sword and spear, obtain a life—and then
 Death came on earth. Steadfast they stood. Byrhtnoð once and again
 Incited them to think on war who glory would obtain
 Each warrior who would win renown against th'accurséd Dane.
 Then came a war-brave trooper forth, and lifting high his lance,
 With shield-guard up, he then began against the chief to advance.
 The earl, so resolute and brave, in turn against him went,
 And each of them to harm the other then was fully bent.
 The pirate hurled a southern spear—the earl was wounded first,
 But shoved then with his shield at once until the shaft he burst—
 He sprang it till it sprang again—more angry yet he grew—
 The pirate proud who wounded him he with a spear pierced through.
 The warrior was skillful,—in the close and heated strife,
 He thrust his fierce foe through the neck and touched his very life.
 Then he another quickly pierced, his corslet burst apart,
 The poisoned shaft through mail and breast stood sticking at his heart.
 The earl was but the blither, and he laughed—the man so brave—
 And for the day's work God had given, to God his thanks he gave.
 A certain warrior hurled a spear, and forth it swiftly sped,
 And, flying from his hand, it pierced thethane of Æthelred.
 But by his side stood Wulfstan's son, a boy, the young Wulfmaer,
 Who from the warrior's side full boldly drew the bloody spear;
 He let the hard shaft go again, he hurled it far away;
 It pierced the man who struck his lord, till on the ground he lay.

Then came a trooper to the earl, to rob the noble lord,
 To steal his jeweled coat of mail, his ornamented sword;
 But Byrhtnoð from its ready sheath drew forth his sword full length,
 Broad and brown-edged, and on the corslet smote with all his strength.
 Yet all too quickly hindered him one of the pirate band,
 And stayed the progress of his arm and marred his good right hand
 So that he could no longer hold the fallow-hilted brand,
 No longer wield his trusty blade, it dropped upon the strand.
 Yet still he spoke courageously, the warrior gray and old,
 He cheered his men and urged them on, his comrades good and bold.
 He could no longer firmly stand upon his faltering feet—
 He looked to heaven:

"O Lord, thou Ruler of mankind, my thanks I render thee
 For all the mercies in this life thou hast bestowed on me.
 And now, O Lord, most gracious God, of thine own graciousness,
 Pity me in my direst need and in my deep distress.
 Be good to my poor spirit, Lord, and grant, I humbly pray,
 My soul into thy shining realm may shortly make its way,
 May go, O King of angels, thither in peace and rest,
 Where, I entreat thee, hell's fierce foes may nevermore molest."
 And then the heathen hewed him down, those warriors fierce and grim,
 And both his shoulder-comrades, too, the men who stood by him;
 The twain who bravely stood by him were Ælfnod and Wulfmaer;
 They gave their lives beside their lord, and lay together there.

Then fled they from the field where they no longer wished to be.
 The sons of Odda were the foremost from the field to flee;
 Godric, the son of Odda, fled—forsook and left behind
 The man who many a time to him had been so good and kind,
 Had given him horses—and yet now on that same lord's own steed
 He and his brothers with him leaped and rode away full speed.
 They took the trappings with his horse—surely that was not right—
 Godrinc and Godwig left the field, they cared not for the fight,
 And on their lord's own battle-horse rode off in headlong flight;
 And turning from the battle-plain, they sought the distant wood
 And fled into a fortress there which for protection stood,
 And there secured themselves. So others—many more than should,
 If they had then remembered all the kindness and the good
 The earl for them had done in life—their chief now lying dead.
 Thus Offa in the council-room in former days once said,
 When he a council held, that many spoke in pride secure,
 Boasting of what, in direst need, they never would endure.

And thus there fell the people's prince, the earl of Æthelred;
 His hearth-companions all then saw their leader lying dead;
 Eager and brave, they hastened forth, resolved to do or die,
 Resolved t'avenge their leader's death or by his side to lie.
 Ælfwine, Ælfric's son, then spoke, a warrior young of years,
 And speaking boldly urged them on—his speech betrayed no fears:
 "Remember ye the times when we at mead have spoke so oft,
 And on the bench within the hall our boast have raised aloft
 About the battles we should fight, the fields that we should hold—
 But now the time is come to test those who are true and bold.

I will make known my lineage and ancestry to you,
 That I was born of Mercian blood, a tribe renowned and true;
 My grandfather was Ealdhelm; a prudent man was he,
 And prosperous in worldly wise, as such a man should be.
 And never shall you censure me or visit me with blame,
 Nor thanes among this people think of me with scornful shame
 That I forsook this sad campaign or from this army fled,
 Now that my chieftain lies upon the field of battle dead.
 To me no greater loss than this could my sad fate afford,
 For he was doubly dear to me, my kinsman and my lord."
 Then forth he went, on battle bent, thinking of his dear thane,
 He drew his spear, and with it pierced one of the pirate train
 So that the pirate fell to earth by that good weapon slain.
 Then Offa spoke in words of cheer—he shook his ashen spear,
 And urged his men right onward—his friends and comrades dear:
 "Lo, now, Ælfwine, thou hast cheered our hearts in sorest need;
 For now our chieftain fallen lies, to us there is indeed
 A need that each the other cheer by act as well as word,
 As long as he can hold in hand his good spear and his sword.
 Now Godric, Odda's coward son, hath us indeed deceived;
 Thereby, that 'twas the earl himself, full many a man believed,
 When, mounted on our chief's good horse, he turned and rode away;
 Our folk were scattered in the field, our phalanx in the fray—
 Perish his deed who put to flight so many men today!"
 Leofsunu then spoke; his shield, as if for an attack,
 He raised, and said: "I will not give a single foot-length back;
 Nor shall the steadfast, taunting me, about Sturmere, say
 That when my lord all lifeless on the field of battle lay
 I journeyed lordless home and left him lying on the field;
 The sword and spear shall take me first—to them my life I yield."
 And then full angry he advanced, the field of battle sought,
 For flight he scorned, and on that field full valiantly he fought.
 Then Dunnere, an old man spoke; aloft he shook his spear,
 And called on each for Byrhtnoð's death to wreak revenge severe:
 "No one who thinks, upon this folk, t'avenge his lord's sad fate
 Will care aught for his safety now, nor can he hesitate."
 Then forward went they, nor a whit for life or safety cared;
 Their followers, too, devoted men, the battle bravely dared—
 The fierce spear-bearers prayed to God to grant it might be so
 They could avenge their dear lord's death by death among the foe.
 The hostage from Northumbria then to the rescue came—
 Of hardy race, brave Ecglaf's son, and Æscferd was his name.
 He did not falter in the fight; full oft he bent his bow—
 Sometimes his arrow struck a shield, sometimes it struck a foe.
 Ever, as long as he had strength his weapon still to wield,
 He dealt out wounds, now and anon, to foes still in the field.
 Still in the front tall Edward stood, boldly and dauntlessly;
 In boastful words he said that he would not a foot-length flee,
 That he would never make retreat while now his chieftain lay—
 Then through their wall of shields he broke, and gainst the foe made way
 And worthily avenged his chief upon the pirate Dane,
 Until at length he lay a corpse upon the slaughter-plain.

And so did Ætheric, his noble comrade bold and true ;
 He, Sibyrht's brother, bravely fought, and many others, too—
 They cleft the keel-shaped shields, they strove against the hostile throng.
 Then burst the shield-brim, and the corslet sang a woeful song.
 There, in the battle, Offa slew the pirate at a blow ;
 He fell to earth, and Gadde's kinsman on the ground lay low.
 But quickly in the fight was Offa hewn down by the sword,
 And thus fulfilled what he before had promised his dear lord :
 That they should both die on the field, or home in safety ride—
 Both live, both die—and thus, thane-like, he lay his lord beside.
 Then came the crash of shields, the pirates made a fierce advance,
 And through the body of the doomed oft darted spear and lance.
 Forth then went Wistan, Thurstan's son, and fought against the Dane,
 And warriors three he slaughtered there, ere he himself was slain.
 Fierce was the fight—the men in battle firmly made their stand ;
 Then fighting fell, worn out with wounds. Death fell upon the land.
 Oswald and Elwold all the while, two brothers, cheered their men,
 And bade their kinsmen-friends, hard-pressed, to hold out firmly then
 And wield their weapons manfully. Then spoke the brave Byrhtwold ;
 His shield he raised, his spear he shook, and he, their comrade old,
 Exhorted then his gallant men, his language was full bold :
 "Our mind must be the bolder, our heart braver, in distress ;
Our courage must grow greater as our company grows less.
 Here lies, all hewn to pieces, in the dust, our noble chief ;
 And who thinks now to leave this place will surely come to grief.
 I now am old, yet, on my part, I surely will not fly—
 Here I resolve that I myself by his dear side will lie."
 And Godric, son of Æthelgar, cheered all his men in mind,
 As oft he let his battle-spear among the pirates wind—
 Not he the craven Godric, who from battle turned aside—
 So stood he in the foremost rank, and fought until he died.

WILLIAM RICE SIMS.

University of Mississippi.

OLD FRENCH INTERPRETATION.

I.

SCHELER druckt 'Berte as grans piés,' 199,
 200 :

"Par Sassogne s'en vinrent, par le duc Nicholai
 La duchoise estoit suer Bertain; quant j'esgardai"
 u.s.w.

Man muss bei dieser abteilung übersetzen :

"Sie (nämlich Pipins gesandte, welche die für ihren könig zur gattin bestimmte Bertha aus Ungarn abholen und Deutschland durchziehen) kamen durch Sachsen daher; durch den herzog Nicolaus war die herzogin eine schwester Berthas."

Man könnte danach allerdings denken, der herzog sei ein bruder der Bertha und die herzogin erst durch ihn eine "schwester" Ber-

thas, d.h., eine *sister-in-law*. Aber aus mehreren andern stellen des gedichts geht unwiderleglich hervor, dass Flor und Blanche-flor zu jener Zeit ausser Bertha und einem sohne, der Grodno und Polen beherrscht, nur noch eine tochter, später im gedichte mit ihrem namen Aelis, hatten, die also an den herzog von Sachsen verheiratet war. Dies richtige verwandtschaftsverhältnis erhalten wir nur durch eine starke interpunction hinter *Nicholai*, die dann auch das *enjambement* aufhebt und also den alexandriner nach altfranzösischer art correcter macht. Das *par* ist dasselbe wie 'Chevalier au lyon,' 267.

"Après me repria que gie
 Par son ostel m'an revenisse,"

oder noch besser, da es sich um eine person

handelt, eben da 554, wo Tobler *par* statt *a* einführt:

"En la fin volantez me vint,
Qu'a mon oste covant tanroie
Et que *par* lui m'an revanroie."

II.

Neben *orb* führt Diez im 'Etymolog. Wörterbuch' *dorp* an, das in keinem unserer Wörterbücher oder glossare zu finden ist und auch schon Mahn bedenklich schien, wozu wohl die schreibung mit *p* beigetragen haben mag. Die ansetzung von *dorp* beruht wohl auf einer falschen auffassung einer stelle, in der das handschriftlich überlieferte wort als *d'orp* aufzufassen ist, wo aber auch eine form *dorp* sinn zu haben schien. Disse stelle ist nun nach meiner auffassung keine andere als ein vers in dem bekannten *enueg* des mōchs von Montaudon (Bartsch, 'Provenzal. Chrestomathie,'⁴ 134, 27-30), wo es heisst:

"et enojam per sant Marti,
trop d'aiga en petit de vi,
e quan trob escassier mati
m'enoja, e d'orp atressi."

Diez kann *dorp* recht wohl als plural aufgefasst haben: "und blinde (verdrissen mich) ebenso."

EUGEN LESER.

Berlin.

HILDEBRAND'S THEORY OF ALLITERATION.

THERE has lately appeared, in the *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht*, vol. v, pp. 577-85, an article entitled "Zum Wesen des Reimes auch des Stabreimes, dabei eine Berichtigung Scherers" in which Rudolf Hildebrand advances a new theory regarding the nature of the so-called Alliteration (Stabreim).

The opening remarks regarding the nature of the German 'Endreim' do not contain much that is really new. 'Great stress is laid on the fact that

"Not the like sound only makes a good rime, but a combination of likeness and unlikeness, not the similarity of the vowel only is essential, but also the difference of the consonants preceding the riming vowel."

He then touches very lightly on identical and

¹ See now Hildebrand himself in the January number of the *Zeitschrift*.

'rührende' rimes and their great infrequency in modern German poetry.² It seems, however, as if Hildebrand were too ready to generalize and draw from these observations far reaching conclusions regarding rime in general. It is not true that rime, wherever it appears, 'shows this quality and nature.' The beauty of rime is just as much subject to change and development, just as different among different races as any other beauty. *Ja: da: ha* are no rimes at all, according to the Arabic standard, while they are perfect rimes to our ear; on the other hand, we should not tolerate *saribu: kutabu: kuṣubu*, although they are perfect Arabic rimes. Cf. also the difference regarding *rimes riches* in French and German, etc.

After these preliminary remarks, Hildebrand proceeds to the discussion of the 'stabreim.' This he considers as falling entirely under the head of Rime. Only in it everything is reversed. The rime stands at the end of the word; the 'stabreim' at the beginning; in the rime the vowels are alike, the consonants differ; in the 'stabreim' the consonants are alike and the vowels differ. Consequently he rejects the term 'alliteration' as inadequately describing the phenomenon.³

This theory is, as far as I am aware, at variance

1. With the majority of writers on the subject (for example, Lachmann in 'Ersch u. Gruber') in claiming the qualitative identity of rime and alliteration;

2. With all authorities in requiring, for a perfect alliteration, a difference of vowels following the alliterating consonants (corresponding to the difference of consonants in the end-rime, of which so much was made above).

1. To settle the first point definitely seems in our present state of knowledge well-nigh impossible. However, there is much which

² They are, however, met with more frequently than H.'s note would lead one to think. There are about a dozen instances in Goethe's smaller poems; Heine also does not avoid them, see White's ed. (Heath). For the O.G. poets see J. Grimm, *Abh. d. k. Ak. d. W.*, Berlin, 1852, p. 521 ff.—'Kl. Schrft.,' iv, 125 ff.

³ The word, by the way, was not coined as late as the last century, as H. thinks, but was used first by Joannes Jovianus Pontanus in his dialogue 'Actius,' fol. 127b ff., of the Aldine ed. of 1519.

would support Lachmann's theory of a different origin. It is not hard to imagine that the inflectional endings must, under certain conditions, cause involuntary rimes, as is the case in many Latin pentameters; for instance, *oscula pugnabit sed tamen apta dabit* (Tib., iv, 54). Of such character seem to have been the Egyptian rimes which Ebers mentions (*Z.f. Aegypt. Spr.*, xv, p. 45). Similar rimes are occasionally found in portions of the poetical books of the Old Testament. Used at first irregularly and sporadically, they are later assigned certain places in the verse and develop thus into the poetical rime, as we have it in a Semitic inscription published by Schlottmann in the *Z.d.D.M.G.*, xxxiii and xxxiv.

Such involuntary and spontaneous origin is hardly to be assumed for the 'stabreim.' The Teutonic 'stabreim,' at least, seems to be due to a conscious effort, and intended as a mnemotechnical aid, binding together a line through its most prominent words.

The rime is usually formed by the secondary and changing elements (suffixes): the 'stabreim' by the primary and stable elements (roots), often with disregard of prefixes. There are hardly any restrictions with regard to the categories of words allowed to carry the rime, while there are quite a number of such restrictions regarding the alliterating words. In the former we have an imperfect beginning (as an occasional ornament) and a gradual development; in the latter a beginning essentially perfect and a gradual decay (into a mere ornament).

2. But let us accept, for the sake of argument, Hildebrand's theory of the qualitative identity of rime and alliteration, and examine his view regarding the difference of the vowels following the alliterating consonant. However, before applying the test of 2252 lines taken at random from most alliterating poems, it is necessary to see what we reasonably may expect to find.⁴

As was said above, the number of available words for an alliterating line is much smaller than that of riming ones for two reasons:

a. Alliteration depends on roots, not suffixes.

⁴ The chief objection which can be raised against the article is, that H. has failed to examine how far his theory, evidently based on *a priori* grounds, is borne out by the facts, he being satisfied with adducing seven instances.

A very liberal deduction ought to be made on this account.

b. Alliteration can be carried only by certain words, according to fixed rules.

From these facts it appears that it is easier to construct alliterating lines where the vowels following the alliterating consonant are different, than such in which they are alike (of the vocabulary of the poet of 'Judith,' out of ninety-six words with initial *s*, only two begin with *sae*, two with *sci*, twelve with *si*, etc.). Now, then, if there really was such a rule, or even only such a tendency, to vary the vowel, we should reasonably expect very few, if any, cases of identical vowels. When Jordan wrote his 'Nibelunge' he held the common view regarding the 'stabreim,' considering only the initial consonant as essential. This poem then, I think, furnishes material very well-suited for a determination of the relative frequency of identity of vowel in alliterating words. That is to say, the percentage of such in the 'Nibelunge' may be taken as a rough average of the frequency of identical vowels, if the poet endeavours neither to introduce nor to avoid it. An examination of five hundred lines shows that somewhat over 11% of the alliterating words have identical vowels (included are the cases of the form: *xa . . . xi xa*; in all five hundred lines there were but two lines in which three alliterating words had identical vowels). Of the alliterating phrases in Latin (collected by Wölfflin, *Sitz. d. bayer. Akad.*) less than 30% (forty out of one hundred and twenty-five) have identical vowels, but a very liberal deduction must be made, because here there are no restrictions as to the words carrying the alliteration, prefixes alliterate, and there are also many cases of etymological alliteration.

It thus appears that in about 10%-15% we should find identical vowels if they are neither purposely avoided nor sought for by the poet.

Let us now look at the statistics, which are based on the following passages: Wessobrunn Prayer, 9 vss.; Hildebrand's Lay, 65 vss.; Muspilli, 100 vss.; Judith, 350 vss.; Beowulf, 784 vss. (from different parts of the poem); Heliand, 557 vss. (from different parts of the poem); Edda, 447 vss. (*Völuspá*, Baldr's Dream, Guðrun's Lay, i.).

Wessobrunn Prayer, 12%; Hildebrand's Lay, 17%; Muspilli, 28%; Judith, about 14%; Beowulf, 10%; Heliand, 20%; Völuspá, over 6%; Baldr's Dream, 8%; Guðrun's Lay, i, 15%.

These figures go to show that in none of the poems examined did the author purposely either seek to introduce or to avoid identical vowels, but that the average percentage is such as we would expect it to be from the nature of the case, and that Hildebrand's theory, which would lead us to expect a much smaller percentage, is not sufficiently supported by facts to warrant a rejection of the old view.

There yet remains one point to be discussed. Hildebrand quotes in support of his theory a passage of Snorri Sturluson's 'Háttatal' (Hafniae, 1848, ed. Arnam, i. 596) to the effect, that "if the höfustaf be a vowel, then the stuðlas should also be vowels and it is more beautiful if each one of them is a different vowel."

But I doubt, whether our author refers to æsthetic beauty at all, whether different vowels really caused a more pleasant sensation to his ear than identical ones. Much rather I am inclined to think, that he calls "beautiful" what he finds in the old poems, which he regards as faultless models. As is well known now, the vowel is not in such cases the alliterating element at all; but what really alliterates is the guttural explosive which precedes the formation of a vowel and is due to the opening of the vocal chords (the Greek smooth breathing, the Arabic hemza, the Hebrew aleph, etc.). We have seen, that in not more than ten to fifteen out of one hundred alliterating verses the vowels following the alliterating consonants are identical. The same, of course, will be the case with regard to the vowels following this guttural explosive; in eighty-five to ninety cases out of one hundred they will be different from each other. Sturluson knew nothing about the guttural explosive, he only saw that the different vowels at the beginning—as it seemed to him—of alliterating words were much more frequent than identical ones. Hence his conclusion that they were preferred, preferable or "more beautiful." If this be the case, his remark cannot be adduced in support of Hildebrand's theory.

HANNS OERTEL.

Yale University.

OLD FRENCH PHONETICS.

La méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des transformations inconscientes du langage, par M. L'ABBÉ ROUSSELOT.

La Phonétique expérimentale et la philologie Franco-Provençale par M. KOSCHWITZ; contained in a deprint of the Compte-rendu du Congrès scientifique international des catholiques, tenu à Paris du 1^{er} au 6 avril 1891. Paris: Picard, 1891. 24 pp.

THE first of these two articles represents an address delivered by the Abbé Rousselot, co-editor with M. Gilliéron of the *Revue des Patois Gallo-Romans*, before the Catholic congress held in Paris during the month of April of last year. M. Rousselot dwells on the importance of a physical study of speech, which must form the basis of all historical study, and refers to certain mechanical appliances, invented by him and others, that register the movements which the different organs of speech undergo. This apparatus is of the most ingenious kind, and has been more fully described by M. Rousselot in the above-mentioned *Revue*, fascs. 14 and 15, where he also shows its possible application in a study of his native patois, that of Cellefrouin. Not feeling myself competent to express any definite opinion on the matter, I would refer the reader to the article in question for further information.

Dr. Koschwitz continues the same theme, and speaks of the importance of such study as that undertaken by M. Rousselot, and emphasizes the fact, that every linguist, in order to be able to cope with the problems which he will encounter, must of necessity pay attention, and a great deal of attention, to the physiology of the organs of speech, and must "d'abord se faire naturaliste, physicien et physiologiste." These methods must at first be applied to the study of living forms of speech, and the information thus gained transferred to the study of the older stages of language. This leads him to speak of the difficulty which every student of French phonology experiences, when he endeavors to compare any modern dialect with the literary language, or with older dialects. The modern patois of Northern France have undergone so marked changes in their rapidity of growth under purely phonetic influences, analogical contamination, or mixture with

surrounding forms of speech, that the aid which they afford in understanding the older forms of language, is often very meager. On the other hand the curious phenomenon is noticed, that the further we proceed toward the South of the French linguistic territory, the more do we notice a certain lack of development and a tendency to retain older forms.

It is to be supposed that the Provençal kept pace in the beginning of its history with the speech of Northern France, but that it grew less rapidly, and doubtless, therefore, we shall often find the key to unsolved problems of the linguistic history of French proper in the patois spoken to-day South of the Charente. Hence, Koschwitz lays stress on the importance of these patois for the study of French, at least in those instances where other means at our disposal, such as the study of the orthography of old texts, the assonances and the modern *Langue d'oïl* dialects fail to give the desired light. To illustrate the helpfulness of such a procedure, he cites two knotty points of Old French phonology; namely, *l̃+s* and the history of the nasal vowels.

It is with regard to the former of these problems, that I desire to add a few remarks on the position taken by the writer. After a short historical sketch of the question, Koschwitz says, p. 16:

'On se demande quelle articulation spéciale une *l* mouillée prend devant une *s*; si elle produit nécessairement une explosive dentale entre elle et la consonne suivante; quelle influence le groupe *ls* exerce, et sur la nature des voyelles précédentes et sur l'articulation de l'*s* qui suit? Prononçait-on *s* ou *z* (*s* sonore)? Était-ce un *d* ou un *t* qu'on insérait entre *l* mouillée et *s*? Est-ce qu'une *l* mouillée suivie de *s* dégage réellement devant soi un *y* qui se réunit avec la voyelle précédente et produit avec elle une diphthongue? Et si ce dégage-ment (qui n'a rien d'improbable) existe en réalité, peut-il se compliquer avec une action simultanée de *l* mouillée sur la consonne suivante?'

All these questions are identical with those to which I endeavored to find an answer in my study on 'Dialectische Eigenthümlichkeiten in der Entwicklung des mouillierten *l* im Altfranzösischen,' *Publications of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION*, vol. v, pp. 52-105. It is not my purpose here to repeat what I stated there, but it may be to the point to recall that

there exists one Old French dialect, which gives unequivocal answers to some of these questions; namely, the Wallonian. Here *l̃* is designated by *lh*; cp. "Poème Moral" *assalhe, batalhe, mervelhe, conselhe*. The inflected forms of words with final *l̃* always have *lz*, never *lhs*, *lhz* or *ilz*; cp. "Dial. Greg." *travalz*, "Job," *travalz*, "Poème Moral" *travaz, conselz*. Here, there certainly exists no *l̃* before the flexional sign, no parasitic *i* before the *l*, and a dental glide between *l* and *s*! But far from solving the whole problem, these facts only complicate it. Each French dialect requires separate study and a distinct answer of its own. On the whole, however, I think it may be confidently asserted, that a parasitic *i* did not develop before *l̃+s*. The inflected forms naturally follow closely the orthography of the uninflected forms, and if an *i* appears before *lz*, it is either merely graphic, or if pronounced, its presence is due to a pronounced parasitic *i* in the uninflected form. In some instances it is possible to follow its gradual inroads; cp. Rol. *-alz* twenty-three times, *-ailz* five times, O. Ps. *-alz* six times, *-ailz* one time; Eul. *melz*, Al. *vielz*, *mielz*, Rol. *mielz* seventeen times, *vielz* seven times, *vielz* five times, *mielz* two times, O. Ps. *vielz*, *mielz*, Q.L.D.R. *vielz*.

The problem, however, which calls for solution is the appearance of *z* as flexional sign in the Norman, Champagne and Lorraine dialects. The Wallonian cannot enter here, for there *z* is found after all *l*'s. In my judgment, there lies at the root of the whole matter an understanding of the way in which a dental explosive develops between *l* and *s*. Most varieties of *l* are produced by forming a stop with the point of the tongue against the gums or teeth, while the sides of the tongue are drawn away from the molar teeth, thus creating two symmetrical channels for the sound, (Jespersen's *βiie*). If this articulation is followed by an *s*, the spirant formed by the point, or blade, of the tongue (and for the present purpose we may accept Jespersen's transcription, *βiεγ²*), the tongue rests for a moment, when the *l* articulation is broken, in the position of a dental stop (*βo*). If the *l* is voiceless and if its articulation is sufficiently marked in muscular tension (Gröber's *l fort*, *Z.f.R.Ph.*, vi, p.

486), this dental glide may develop to an independent stop; $l+s$ becomes $l-t-s$.

In the case of $\tilde{l}+s$ on the other hand, no such conditions for the spontaneous development of a dental explosive exist. Here the stop is effected by the front of the tongue against the hard palate, while the point of the tongue rests behind the lower teeth and does not participate in the articulation ($\beta\epsilon\gamma\text{ii}^{\text{e}}$). Sweet, 'Handbook,' p. 44, suggests that in the first attempts to produce this difficult articulation the learner should hold the point of the tongue firmly against the lower gums, so that the front alone may articulate. From such a position the tongue can easily and naturally pass to an s without previously sounding a dental explosive, but this action does not preclude, of course, the possibility of an interposition of t between \tilde{l} and s . It is quite as easy to interpose a labial explosive; the question is merely, whether a latent dental explosive exists between $\tilde{l}+s$, as is evidently the case for $l+s$.

But we may go further, and suppose that the tongue does form a stop at the same place, where it divides the articulation for \tilde{l} , before it passes on to the dental spirant. In this case the only possible explosive is a palatal t' , ($\beta\epsilon\gamma\text{ii}^{\text{e}}$ becomes $\gamma\text{o}^{\text{e}}$). Such an articulation would have a very decided influence on the following s , and would give to it a sound, which with Chabaneau I will call "un son plus sifflant"; perhaps "plus chuintant" would be a better term. Such a supposition falls, however, if z in Old French texts denotes ts .

Now, let us see what must be the action of the tongue in passing from \tilde{l} to s . In carefully pronouncing these two sounds in succession, it will be noticed that the first movement of the tongue consists in flattening out its sides to their natural position in close proximity to the molar teeth. The s cannot be pronounced at the same point as $s+\tilde{l}$, and there will next be felt a tendency to backward action of the tongue. At the same time it will take on the requisite sagittal narrowing for the s , even before that sound is reached, and the result will be a succession of consonantal noises which may be represented by $\text{t}'\text{w}js$. Of these, t' will be the least prominent, and the acoustic effect of the whole combination will be very

similar to $\tilde{l}js$. So much, I think, is plain, if $\tilde{l}z$ is to be similar in formation to lz , it could only have sounded like $\text{t}'\text{t}s$, as Chabaneau correctly supposed. Such a pronunciation, however, would have burdened the language with two plural signs, \tilde{s} and s , the existence of which is not probable. I believe that the \tilde{l} was forced to assimilate itself to the following s , since the pronunciation of this sound was fixed for morphological reasons, and \tilde{l} being thus drawn forward out of its palatal position, as voiceless and *l fort*, lz was the result.

It will be in the highest degree interesting to possess accurate physiological descriptions of the pronunciation of $\tilde{l}+s$ in the present Provençal dialects. Professor Gröber in a private communication called my attention to the orthography of the 'Donatz Proensals,' published by Stengel, Marburg, 1878. The testimony which the orthography of this document bears, seems convincing for Gröber's point of view, and against my own statement, l. c., p. 103. We find there only lhz ($=\tilde{l}+s$), lz ($=ll+s$) and ls ($=l+s$). At the same time it must be noted, however, that the rules of the Donatz were, to say the least, not followed consistently by the Provençal poets; cp. Bartsch, 'Chrest. Prov.' *foills*: *oills* 135-27: 136-29; *dezacoills*: *capdoills* 137-6: 14; *orgoills*: *escoills* 137-21: 28; *vermelhs*: *solelhs* 267-1: 2; *viels*: *miels* 392-13: 14 (and in the same poem *conselh*: *espelh* 391-11: 12). These are to my knowledge the only rhymes of this kind in the Chrestomathy. But if the 'Donatz Proensals' really represented the actual use of the writers, is it not strange that so large a collection of poems as that of Bartsch presents no rhymes in accordance with these rules?

I shall not attempt an explanation of Prov. lhz ; but, at the same time, I think it is evident that the l in the combination lz in later French was not a palatal l , for it could fall or vocalize to u , just as every other l . We have, therefore, to grant a fronting of the articulation for some stage of the history of the language; that this fronting took place in such a way that $\tilde{l}s$ became ls and then lts (lz) I consider, with Gröber, extremely improbable. I believe rather that $\text{t}'\text{w}js$ changed to lts under the influence of the dental s , which had a fixed

pronunciation, since it was the plural sign of the language, and in this manner I desire to modify my opinion as stated, l. c., p. 103.

A priori, the Provençal can no more give definite answers to questions of French phonetics, than can the Wallonian to those of the Norman dialect; at the same time, a better understanding of all the possibilities of phonetic development and of the actual facts in the existing patois south of the Charente, must necessarily be very helpful in a consideration of general phonetic problems. I shall await with great interest some realization of the hopes of Professor Koschwitz.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Johns Hopkins University.

ANGLO-SAXON READER.

An Anglo-Saxon Reader, edited, with Notes and Glossary, by James W. Bright, Ph.D., Associate Professor of English Philology at the Johns Hopkins University. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1891. 12mo, pp. viii, 385.

It would be ungracious, to say the least, if the writer of this review, who for ten years has been teaching Sweet's 'Anglo-Saxon Reader,' should utter a word of disparagement about it. Sweet deserves the heartiest thanks of every one who has to do with the Philological study of English; and if now and then he has put forth bitter words,—as in the preface to his 'Oldest English Texts,'—who can deny that he has had abundant provocation? Good as his work has been, however, I am inclined to think that the best results will be obtained by our ordinary college classes here in America, if we use from the start the Cook-Sievers 'Grammar' and this new 'Reader' which Professor Bright has just presented to his colleagues. Such a combination insures thoroughness, and yet offers no sharp or sudden difficulties. The phonology in Sweet's 'Reader' is neither detailed nor exhaustive, and is distinctly difficult; and there is a crowded, abrupt fashion in his treatment of the inflections which gives needless trouble. Compare, for instance, his treatment of adjective stems,—where *ēce* is ranged quite without explanation of the reason, under the "short" declension,—with the lucid statements of Sievers.

Let these books, then, be used from the start. The primer or "beginning-book" is of doubtful benefit; a student who is ready to study Anglo-Saxon at all, is quite prepared to use the regular grammar. The time allotted to our subject in any ordinary college course is so meagre that a teacher must in most cases aim at rapid work and speedy results. A dozen paradigms and a few hints on pronunciation give the student basis for translation, which should begin at once; progress thereafter should be marked by three features:—careful translation, with grammatical analysis working gradually up to the difficulties of inflection and phonology; reading at sight; and composition. The last feature is probably neglected in most of our classes; but visitors or members of Professor Zupitza's *Seminar* at Berlin will recollect how much stress is laid by that admirable teacher upon a facility of translating from the vernacular. Passages are given in German to be translated immediately into Anglo-Saxon,—a discipline of evident value. Indeed, a booklet of materials for such exercises would be a goodly offering for some one to make to his profession: not, of course, that we could expect the young lions of original research to hunt this ignoble quarry, but peradventure there be humbler who have borne the burden of instruction and are willing to minister to the lower needs.

To come closer to the subject of this review, I believe that Professor Bright's book will forward the study of Anglo-Saxon in general, and will be a friend and aider of those who would have modern English kept in communication with its chief and proudest sources. For while the university teacher may look forward to a doctor's degree for his pupil, and may insist upon a thorough knowledge of every inch of ground in the field of Old-English philology, it is the problem of teachers in the ordinary American college how they shall make most profitable to the student the hour or two weekly, for perhaps a single year, which he devotes to this study. We tell such a student that his brief course in Anglo-Saxon is not an "intellectual luxury," but rather an almost necessary condition of appreciation in his estimate of English history, English literature and the English tongue. To read in the

original King Alfred's preface to the translation of Gregory's 'Pastoral Care' is to come closer to the heart of English patriotism, to get a deeper insight into the meaning of Germanic supremacy in modern history, than could be done by reading volumes of ordinary comment. The 'Battle of Maldon' is itself a liberal education. We owe thanks to Professor Bright for retaining these and other favorites, and for resisting the temptation to seek a flavor of originality by pushing the claims of new candidates. The additions, however, are good,—particularly the "Conversion of Edwin." With regard to verse, the "Phœnix" is properly chosen; though I am bound to confess some lack of appreciation for its much praised grace and beauty. It is well that no extract is given from the 'Béowulf': though I should have been glad to find the passage of 'Exodus' (Grein, vii,=vv. 446-515), which describes in such true Germanic fashion the ruin of the Egyptian host, and contains the most nervous metaphor in the whole range of our early poetry:

.... *rodor swipode*
meredēaða mēst

By the way, has no comparing soul, such as are so busy in these latter days, hit upon the parallel between this famous picture of ocean raging like an angry warrior,—

gārsecg wēdde,
up ātēah, on slēap . . .
fāmigbōsma flōdwearde slōh
unhlēowan wæg alde mēce

and the pulsing rhythm of Swinburne's chorus in 'Erechtheus,' where a battle on land and the onrush of a flooding ocean are described in absolutely interpenetrating allegory? Take such phrases as "the lips of the rearing breaker with froth of the manslaying flood"; "the terror and thunder of water that slays as it dies"; or these lines:

"And the meadows are cumbered with shipwreck of chariots
that founder on land,
And the horsemen are broken with breach as of breakers,
and scattered as sand. . . .
And the clang of the sharp shrill brass through the burst of
the wave as it shocks,
Rings clear as the clear wind's cry through the roar of the
surge on the rocks"

How like they are, and how different; and

what a pretty study in the evolution of poetical style! The omission of an extract from the 'Béowulf' is good, for the simple reason that the 'Béowulf' should always be read as a whole. True, if there is a chance to read the 'Elene,' say, between the 'Reader' and the 'Béowulf,' good; but if time is limited, let the student dash manfully into the churning breakers of our old epos, with all the spirit of Leibnitz's maxim that to the enthusiast hard things are easy and easy things are hard. It is manslaughter to drag a class through the 'Elene,' if no compensation follow in the shape of the 'Béowulf.' Even in longer courses and with ample leisure, a very small portion of those half-childish paraphrases will suffice. 'Widsið' is supremely interesting for its incidental relations; 'Déor' justifies itself; the 'Wanderer' and the 'Seafarer' and the 'Ruin' are preliminary studies to the 'Poema Morale' or Gray's more famous poem, and are amply worth our reiterated study; 'Maldon' and 'Brunanburh' belong with 'Chevy Chase' and 'Agincourt'; but, saving magnificent 'Judith' and a few passages like that from the 'Exodus,' these biblical paraphrases, and the other religious poems, with their incongruous mingling of battle-music and nursery-hymns, remind us of some heavily armed and sword-clanking dragoon pushing a perambulator.

While Professor Bright has thus given us a sort of anthology, he has not lost sight of his prime intention; he has kept his eye upon the needs of the student of Anglo-Saxon in and for itself. In this regard, text and notes, excellently done, are supplemented by a careful glossary; this has been a weak side of previous Readers, but is here worked out with obvious care. References are given to the various forms of a word, and case or tense is specified. An appendix contains Lactantius *de Ave Phœnice*,—a capital chance for the student to contrast not only the style and syntax of Latin and early English, but to institute more elaborate and detailed comparisons. Appendix ii, on Anglo-Saxon versification, is a careful and welcome summary of the conclusions reached by Sievers in his well-known investigations. A third appendix, with brief account of Anglo-Saxon poetical style, the kennings and parallelisms, would have been

useful. Moreover, it seems here and there that the notes are too scanty; not in the way of translation or grammatical comment, but in the matter of facts and historical or antiquarian interests. For example, the dramatic story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard is of great interest for its incidental description of an Anglo-Saxon house; references to Tacitus and other early Germanic sources, with a quotation or two from authorities not accessible even to the main body of teachers, would be helpful indeed. Still, we must not ask the maker of such a book to ride all these hobbies; and we are reminded that a teacher is grateful nowadays if the text-book leaves him any chance to impart a fresh bit of knowledge.

I have had neither time nor inclination for mere error-hunting; and, indeed, the English reviewer in the *Academy* brought back little from his quest. Treasure trove of this somewhat ungracious sort should be collected by teachers who use the book and put it to a true test, and are willing to send their discoveries and suggestions directly to the author. This the present reviewer promises to do. Meanwhile, it is ground for congratulation among teachers that a student of English philology may begin his work with such a text-book, and may feel from the start the guidance of good taste and sound scholarship.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

Haverford College.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

La Perle Noire par Victorien Sardou and *Le Voyage autour de ma Chambre* par Xavier de Maistre: Edited with Lives of the Authors, Vocabulary, Notes and Composition Exercises by J. SQUAIR, B. A., Lecturer in French in University College, Toronto, and J. MACGILLVRAV, Ph.D., Professor of Modern Languages, Queen's College, Kingston. Toronto: W. J. Gage & Co., 1891. xi, 322 pp.

EDUCATIONAL authorities in Canada, evidently in the effort to bring some uniformity into the requirements in modern languages for admission to the universities, have prescribed these two works for what they term "the High School Leaving and University Matriculation Examination." The present edition has been

prepared in response to that requirement and annotated with special reference to it. It is a neat little volume, in good clear type, containing, besides the text, short biographical sketches of the authors, a good vocabulary, ample notes and a valuable and instructive set of composition exercises based on the idioms in the texts.

The selection of these two texts for the University Matriculation Examination is, no doubt, a happy one, since both are fine specimens of later French prose, clear and pure in style and well adapted, especially the narrative version of 'La Perle Noire,' to the practical study of the language by those who have already had some training in French. The editors have done their work well. The biographical sketches are good, but we venture the suggestion that they are too short. De Maistre gets two small pages, Sardou five. Even beginners, and certainly High School students and incoming University men, would appreciate and profit by a more extended account of the literary character and importance of the authors. The notes are quite elementary and well suited to the needs of beginners, except in that they often give more help—especially by translating too much—than is necessary or advisable even for beginners. Students advanced enough to attempt these texts at all do not need to have words and phrases like *plus vite, malheureusement, la foudre est tombée, bonnes à rien, deux fois par jour, sans laisser trace, sans encombre, il faut qu'il ait, et tout me dire*, etc., translated for them in the notes, or to be told that *tu, toi*, etc., are used in familiar address. A large number of omissions, discovered unfortunately too late, have rendered the "Addenda to Vocabulary" necessary and the texts still contain a good many words not found in either Vocabulary or Addenda.

The "composition exercises" are an interesting and valuable addition. The editors have picked out the idioms and peculiar expressions occurring in each page of the texts, and, with slight changes, have skillfully wrought them into eight or ten English sentences for re-translation into French. These exercises, if written at intervals as the student progresses through the text, cannot fail to be of much

practical assistance in mastering the difficult subject of French idioms and, in the hands of a competent teacher, they will do good service as a basis for conversational exercises.

WALLER DEERING.

Vanderbilt University.

FRENCH COMPOUNDS.

Ueber re- und ré- im Französischen von MAX SOHRAUER.*

THE new material made available by the appearance of Sachs' 'Französisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch' led the author to a fresh attempt at fixing the rules under which the Latin prefix RE becomes *re-* or *ré-* in French. A number of writers besides Diez, Darmesteter and Mätzner had treated the subject, notably E. Gerlach (Herrig's *Archiv*, lxxvii, 201-208), whose article Sohrauer names as the basis of his own. Besides arranging the results already obtained, the author has taken a long step toward the final clearing up of the question by explaining the present confusing variations in the accentuation and pronunciation of the particle, as the result of a struggle between conflicting literary and popular usages. As his conclusions cannot fail to be of value to all who have to do with French as written, they are here given somewhat in full.

The Latin form RED appears in French in a few learned words and always as *ré-*, except in *redonder* and derivatives (*rédonder* also found).

The prefix appears in composition mostly with verbs; for substantives, a convenient rule is that of Gerlach—in dissyllables *re-* bears no accent. The exceptions are: *récent*, *récit*, *rétus*, *réchaud*, *réduit*, *rédam*, *réfect*. *Réchauf* should be added. In composition with verbs, *re-* appears with open *e* (é), close *e* (è), and with the neutral vowel, or *e* "mute" (e).

1. *Re-* appears in closed syllables and bears no accent. All consonant groups close the syllable, except mute+liquid; *ss* (save in *ressayer*, *ressuyer* [also é], *ressusciter* [also é] with their derivatives); *sc* in *resceller*, *rescousse* (é also è); *st* in *restagnation*, *restipuler*.

**Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, lxxxv. Band, 1. Heft, p. 29.

2. The boundaries between *ré-* (é) and *re-* (è), which appear in open syllables, are more difficult to fix. Here is imperative the separation of learned words from popular words, including under the latter head words inherited from the Folk Latin vocabulary, words of French popular origin, and learned words which have been taken into, and undergone the influences of, the popular speech.

a. In compounds of *re*+vowel, this division is easily made. Popular: (*e* elided) *rabaisser*, *remplir*, *réchapper*, *rissir* (old), *roffrir*, *rhabiller*. Learned: *réadopter*, *réexporter*, *rééditer*, *réimporter*, *réoccuper*, *réunir*, *réhabiliter*. Two forms are often recognized: *rappeler*—*réappeler*, *rembarquer*—*réembarquer*, *répouser*—*réépouser* (E. About), *rhabituer*—*réhabituer*, etc. Note also the following double forms, with or without difference of meaning: *rémondre* (=re+émoudre) and *remoudre* (=re+moudre). So *récrier* (=re+écrier), *répousseter*, *rétrendre*, *réchampir*, *réventer*, by the side of *recrier* (=re+crier), *repouster*, etc. Note also *régayer*—*regayer*, *rémailler*—*remailler*.

b. In *re*+single consonant (mute+liquid, *ss*) apparent disorder reigns. The author, however, shows that *ré-* is to be expected in words of learned origin and *re-* in those of popular origin. Popular: *recevoir*, *refuser*, *recueillir*, *rechercher*, *repentir*, *reposer*, *retenir*, etc., etc. Learned: *recupérer*, *rediger*, *référer*, *réconcilier*, *réclamer*, *réfuter*, etc., etc. It may be added that this conflict between the learned and popular pronunciations of the particle, appears early. At the time of the enrichment of the language in the sixteenth century, the *savants*, in making new words on Latin or Greek models, wrote *ré-* as well as *dé-* and *pré-*,¹ probably under the influence of the Latin pronunciation of the schools,² or by analogy to *e* in the common prefix *res-* (=re+ex, etc.). At the same time the popular usage was to pronounce *re*,³ a usage which seems to have remained unchanged to our day, as it is in full life in popular speech at the present time.⁴ The popular usage has, more-

¹ Thurot, 'De la Prononciation Française,' i., 113.

² *Ibid.* Intro., xci, ff.

³ Thurot, i, 137. ⁴ Agnel, 'De l'Influence du Langage Populaire,' etc., p. 2 ff.

over, superseded the former literary usage, and to-day *ré-* is not written in new formations by the literary class, except in compounds of *re*+vowel thus: *réagenouiller*, *réemboîter*, *réinventer*, *réorganiser*, but *rebannir*, *recalculer*, *reclasser*, *retraverser*; *s* *réarrêter*, *réadmettre*, but *repourvoir*, *relaxer*, *retransférer* (Littré: Supplément).

From this long-continued opposition of the literary and popular usages, the author explains:

First: the following (complete) list of double forms: *récompenser*—*recompenser*, and *récréter*, *réfléchir*, *réformer*, *réparer*, *répartir*, *résigner*, *résonner*, *réprouver*, by the side of *recréer*, *réfléchir*, etc. In these forms it is of practical importance to note that in all the compounds with *re-* the particle has *é*, and expresses simple repetition of the action of the *simplex*; while the learned forms with *ré-* show derived meanings. (*Refléchir*='fléchir de nouveau'; *réfléchir*='ponder'; etc.).

Secondly: the presence of *re* in learned forms by analogy to the popular usage: *registrar* (but *régistration*), *rebel* (but *rébellion*), *relegation*, *relation*, *reliques*, etc.⁶ In secondary compounds, *é* often goes to *è*: *religion*—*irreligion*, *reprochable*—*irréprochable*, *relation*—*corrélation*.

Evidently, therefore, for the *re-* compounds discussed under *b*, no principle can be given beyond the general rule of separation of learned from popular forms. For students who cannot make this distinction, as the author says, "gedächtnismässige Uebung" is the only resource.

c. Old French *res*+cons. appears in the modern language, with few exceptions, as *ré*+cons. (always *é* except *retable* [*è*] *retreindre* [*è*]:—*répit* (O. Fr. *respit*) *récrire* (O. Fr. *rescrire*) *réveiller* (O. Fr. *resveiller*), etc.

In compounds of *re*+*s*+vowel, some difficulties arise:

⁵ Darmesteter, 'De la Création Actuelle de Mots Nouveaux dans la Langue Française,' etc., p. 141.

⁶ Thurot, I, p. 114 ff., gives a considerable list of words in which usage formerly hesitated between the learned and popular forms. *Réserver* (Bouhours, 1694); *réserver* (Richelet, 1680); Andry (1689) gives *résoudre* and *resoudre*; and many others. These variations in accentuation mostly came to an end on the appearance of the Dictionary of the Academy in 1740.

1. *Ress-* has *é* in all words, except *ressayer*, *ressuyer*, and *ressusciter* with their derivatives;

2. Double forms as *resaigner*—*ressaigner*, *resouffler*—*ressouffler*, *resécher*—*ressécher*, etc.

1. The *é* (or *è*) in *ressayer*, *ressuyer*, the author correctly traces to the initial *é* (or *è*) in *es-* (*ressayer*=*re*+*essayer*, *ressuyer*=*re*+*es-suyer*). The same explanation is advanced for *ressusciter*, but the necessary **essusciter* is not known in Old French, while *susciter* and *resusciter* occur frequently. The word has been used in popular speech, as its *ss* shows, and the avoidance of *é* (a mid-mixed-wide vowel) is perhaps to be explained by the strong high-front-narrow group -*susci-* which follows.

2. The author distinguishes the forms with *ss* as "französische Bildungen," and as of learned origin forms such as *résister*, *résoudre*. He also notes that the latter have always the voiced *s* (=z), except in *réséquer*, *résection*. No explanation, however, is advanced for the occurrence of the same form with *s* and *ss*.

It appears that here also is a case of opposing usages in the literary and popular speech as early as the sixteenth century. Among the people, in compounds of *re*+*s*+vowel, the feeling that the word was composite caused the formerly initial *s* to remain voiceless, even when thus intervocal, while in the learned usage, this *s* was voiced.⁷ In popular forms which earned the recognition of the *savants*, the voiceless *s* was denoted by *ss*.⁸ Coming to our own day, in new compounds the *s* is treated as other single consonants by literary writers, and is not doubled, but at the same time retains its own sound: *resiffler*, *resigner*, *resonner*, *resouper*, *resubdiviser*. The forms with *rés*, (=rèz) are, however, so numerous that the orthographic designation of the voiceless *s* (by *ss*) is still felt to be needed. In a number of cases the double forms exist: *reseller*—*resseller*, *resaluer*—*ressaluer*, *resangler*—*ressangler*, *resemmer*—*ressemer*, etc. In other cases only the form with *ss* exists, an indication of popular origin or use: *ressaisir*, *ressauter*, *ressembler*, *resserrer*, *ressortir*, *ressouvenir*, etc.

⁷ Thurot II, 219.

⁸ *Ibid.* II, 386, quoting Cauchie (1575).

Lastly, it may be noted that the popular pronunciation of *re*+*s*+vowel (= *res*) has apparently invaded the territory of the vowel in closed syllable, in *restagnation*, *restipuler*. The further examples given by the author—*resceller* and *rescousse* (*ε*, *ε*) are only apparent exceptions to the rule of *ε* in closed syllable. In *resceller*, *sc*=*s*, the syllable is not closed, and the case does not differ from those in the last paragraph. *Rescinder* and derivatives are rather to be adduced as exceptional, as we should expect *ε*. *Rescousse* (*rek*- and *resk*-) is an apparent exception only, as we have *ε* only when *s* is silent; when *s* is heard, *ε* regularly appears.

It is unfortunate that what is perhaps the latest utterance on this subject—that of Koschwitz, in his 'Grammatik der Neuf Französischen Schriftsprache,' i. (Berlin: 1889)—should be so expressed as to be misleading in at least two respects. He says (p. 25):

"Nach ihnen [that is, Old French *des*, *res*, *tres* before Cons.] richteten sich *dés* vor Vokal, und *dé*, *ré* . . . die im Laufe der Zeit immer mehr altem *de*, *re* mit dumpfem *e* Konkurrenz machen, in Neubildungen mit *de* fast ausschliesslich herrschen, und auch bei *re*, wenn es nicht iterativ gesetzt wird."

The very natural interpretation of this sentence, namely, that *ré*- is used in new formations at the present day (*Neubildungen*) except when the particle is iterative, in which case *re*- is used—would be wrong in view of the facts. In the present literary usage *re*- may be prefixed with iterative force to any verb whose action is capable of repetition; in these cases the form *re*- is used (except before vowels): *redéployer*, *redébattre*, *recarboniser*, etc. As seen above, new (literary) compounds with a *simplex* beginning with a vowel, the form *ré*- is used, and here, again, the prefix is purely iterative. Outside of these cases, new compounds with *ré*- are extremely rare, and the accent is usually traceable to related forms, as *réflecter* made from *réflecteur* (Littré: 'Supplément').

Prof. Koschwitz evidently intended to restate Sohrauer's principle that the form *ré*- had a strong life during the period of enrichment and may be expected in words of learned origin, while *re*-, oftenest with iterative force, is to be expected in words of popular origin.

But it must be noted that in the popular speech *re*- has been used as a prefix with no less than six different significations besides that of iteration (*nicht iterativ*), usages which have left numerous and important traces in the language.⁹ To cite examples of only one of these, that of compounds in which the prefix apparently adds nothing to the meaning of the *simplex*: *remercier*, *reluquer*, *renifler*, *remonter*; and *receler*, *reconforter*, *remontre*, given by Thierry (1564).¹⁰

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PLAY OF THE WEAVERS OF COVENTRY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I have read with great interest a notice by Prof. Davidson, in the March issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES, in which he calls attention to the fact that certain parts of the play of the Weavers of Coventry and of the twentieth York play are the same. This is but another of a number of similar instances made known of late years which prove that the Old English Mystery Plays we possess did not all originate independently, but that comparatively many of them, either as a whole or in part, were imitated or copied from some of the others. As an accurate knowledge of the extent and character of these relations is important for the determination of the origin and development of the religious drama in England, every new instance of this kind must needs be of great interest to students of this special subject.

For this reason I hope that Prof. Davidson will not content himself with so brief a notice of his discovery. Further details are especially desirable in this case; for as far as my knowledge and experience go, it is not very easy to get access to copies of the Weavers' play. This play was privately printed in 1846 in Edinburgh for the Abbotsford Club, and I did not succeed, for instance, in tracing a

⁹ Darmesteter, 'Formation,' p. 99; 'Création,' p. 141; Agmel, op. cit.

¹⁰ Quoted by Darmst., 'Formation,' p. 97.

single copy of it in Germany. There is a copy of it in the British Museum (press-mark: Ac 8247 2), and while in London some three years ago, I began copying it with a view of comparing it with the other extant plays on the same subject, but as my time was very limited, and as the play turned out to be much longer than I had expected (about 1250 lines), I could copy only a very small portion of it, not including the part Prof. Davidson refers to.

I compared, however, the whole play with the corresponding two plays, xviii ("Purification") and xx ("Christ Disputing in the Temple,") of the 'Ludus Coventriae'—of which the Weavers' play does not form a part—and can say that they are entirely independent of one another.

If on the other hand, as Prof. Davidson has found, parts of the Weavers' play agree with parts of the twentieth York play, the question as to their mutual relation may easily become more complicated than it might seem to be at first sight; for some portions of the York play occur almost word for word in the corresponding plays, both of the Towneley and of the Chester collections, as I have shown in *Anglia*, vol. xi, p. 260 ff. In case these parts should happen to be the same as the "sixteen stanzas of the York play," mentioned by Prof. Davidson, there would be no less than four parallel versions of the same original play or part of a play; and even if we take it for granted that the York play in its primitive form was the original version, the question remains to be answered whether the other three were directly taken from the York play, or partly from each other.

Furthermore, in carefully reading the Weavers' play, my attention was especially attracted, in the part preceding the "Presentation in the Temple" proper, by two scenes between Mary and Joseph, very similar to each other. Both of these scenes represent husband and wife as indulging in one of those conjugal quarrels so common on the mediæval stage, and in both instances Joseph addresses the audience, complaining of the trials of married life and pronouncing happy those that have been wise enough to remain single. These scenes seemed to me, at the time, to agree very closely with a similar one in one of the plays of either

York, Chester, or Towneley, but I was unable to carry the investigation any further, and am now not in possession of all the necessary material for taking it up again.

In short, it seems to me that the relations of the Weavers' play to the twentieth York play, and possibly to the other plays on the same subject (with exception, however, of Coventry xviii and xx), are important enough to warrant a more detailed investigation; while on the other hand, the interesting notice of Prof. Davidson will be of but little profit to most scholars, unless at least the corresponding parts of the two plays be printed. My object then in writing these lines is to call attention to these two circumstances, and I hope that either Prof. Davidson or some one else who has access to the Abbotsford Club print of the Weavers' play, will soon give us the needed details.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

ANGLO-SAXON PHONOLOGY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Permit me a few words suggested by the remarks of Professor Hempl in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, 251. It is well known that initial *h* was very weak in the North, and so might not possess consonantal value when brought into the medial position as proposed. But how much stronger was it in Mercian?

Compare with the list given by Bouterwek (p. cxl), and with Lindelöf ('Sprache d. Rit. v. Durham,' §44; s. also the *Nation*, lii, 72) the following words which occur in R:

Initial *h* is wanting in: *is* (ejus) 7. 24; 22. 24; 24. 46; *us* 17. 25; *eard* 25. 24; *eorta* 6. 21; *-um* 18. 35; *cora* 6. 15 etc. (9); *eo* (hēo) 16. 18; *æfdon* 8. 33; *æfð* 13. 12; (cf. *æbbe*, Charters 48. 19); *ge-yrdon* 19. 25; *yngrade* 25. 35; (of less significance, the foreign words *erodes* 2. 1; *ymne* 26. 30).

Inorganic *h* appears in: *heow* (vobis) 6. 14; *hœhtnisse* 5. 10 *hoehtende* 5. 12; *hehtende* 5. 11; *his* (est) 3. 3; 5. 3; 17. 4; 22. 20; *hoð* 5. 34. 36; *a-e* 26. 72; *-as* 5. 33; *hefalsap* 9. 3; *-adum* 27. 39; *hefalsunge* 15. 19. I omit, as less important, the frequent cases where *h* is inorganic, or wanting, before consonants. For the 'V. Ps.,' cf. Zeuner, p. 84; for 'Corpus,' Dieter, p. 66.

Now strong medial or final *h* did not always effect *eo* in Mercian. Shall it be assumed, then, that weak initial *h*, brought into the medial position, changed *eo* to *e* persistently in the case in question?

A careful statistical analysis of the language of the "Durham Book" is still wanting, and we cannot speak with certainty about it. But it passes for an independent dialect. Are we at liberty, therefore, to speak of doublets in such a dialect as "no stranger" than in a dialect known to be mixed, like that of Chaucer, still less modern English?

Again *geoc* should not be adduced to show the probability of *geo-* forms (from *ju-*) in the North since it represents W.Gc. *jo-* (cf. Sievers, §74; Cosijn, p. 70). It has gone a different road from *ging*, *gigod*. Yet even in this very word the tendency against "palatal influence" in North. and Merc. may be plainly seen. The Durham Rit. has *iocce* (cf. Lindelöf, p. 24), and *R₁* has only *ioc* II. 29. 30.

The only remains of Old North. that we possess, aside from a few inscriptions, are the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual. If no genuine case of *geo-* (= *ju-*) can be found in these texts, it can only be assumed without evidence that such forms existed. The special peculiarity for North. is *gi-* (= *ju-*), cf. *gigod* etc., a change which Lindelöf confesses is not clear to him. On the other hand, Mercian keeps *in-*, *gu-* unchanged (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, 251). This appears to be a characteristic difference in dialect.

EDWARD M. BROWN.

University of Cincinnati.

FURTHER NOTES TO PARIS'S 'EXTRAITS DE LA CHANSON DE ROLAND.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—To Professor Sheldon's article entitled "A Few Notes on Old French Phonology" in the March number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, I venture to add a statement of some of the difficulties encountered by the student in the use of Paris's 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland.'

In the 'avertissement' we are told that

"Un exercice très utile pour les étudiants sera de contrôler toutes les étymologies et d'expliquer toutes les formes qui s'y trouvent à l'aide des règles de phonétique et de flexion données dans les observations grammaticales."

The author's plan of tracing the phonetic changes backward from the French form to the Latin, involves the disadvantage of leaving unexplained those sounds in the Latin etymon that have disappeared in the course of development. While the student may find an explanation of all the sounds in *païens*, *chedables* and *quinze*, he is compelled to consult other treatises in order to learn under what conditions the *g* in PAGANUS, the *ð* in *CATABOLUM, and the *d* in QUINDECIM have disappeared. A few pages devoted to general rules for the development of the word from the Latin starting-point, would satisfy what seems to be a real need.

In the table of the "Valeur phonétique des caractères employés," we find:

ð.—o ouvert ou bref (*sotte*, *port*).

ð.—o fermé ou long (*sot*, *côte*).

In the examples here given, the *o* of *port*, on the contrary, is *ouvert long*, and that of *sot* is at least not *fermé long* (it is "*fermé moyen*" in the "Tableau figuratif" of the new French dictionary of Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, p. xxvi).—According to §9, ILLAC would give *lai*, but *la* is the form occurring in the text (ll. 16, 24, 168).—The nom. pl. of the definite article *li* (ILLI) is explained in §18, but the exceptional development of the nom. sing. *li* is not.—In §27 *guascoigne* and *guascoing* are cited as examples of the formation of the diphthong *oi* from *o*, while in §55 *ign* and *ing* (final) are noted as the graphic representations of *ñ*.—It is stated in §28 that the diphthong *ou* "provient de *ō*, ð plus *u* (*lou*, *dous*, *dessoure*)," but in the case of *dessoure*, in which *soure* comes from *sovre* (*sobra*, *sopra*), neither the development of *v* from *p* (cf. §42), nor that of *u* from *v* (cf. §29) is given.—The statement in §52 that Latin *rr* persists does not apply to *rr*, become final: *turris*, *tors*, l. 3 (see Bourciez, 'Phonétique française' §§171, 1 and 172, 1).—In the case of *quinze* (§56, l. 6) a reference to §46, l. 10 (*z*=voiced *s*) would be of assistance.—The rule for *dz* from *d* medial + *j* (VIRIDIARIUM, *vergier*) is omitted in §58.—It is nowhere

made clear why the development of the tonic vowel in Ger. SCAC, *eschac* should have differed from that of Arabic SCHAH, *eschès*.—No explanation is given of the *e* in the final syllable of *furent* (v. 12) and other 3d pl. pret. forms.—The development of initial Germanic *hr* to *r* (HRODLAND, *Rodlant*) is also unmentioned.—The explanation of the nasal *e* (p. 7, l. 3) does not cover the case of the preposition *en* (IN).—The origin of the dative-genitive case-form of the per. pronoun *lui* is unexplained.—The use of *si* in the sense of *et* (to mark the transition), as in verses 391, 395, 500, 504, 697, etc., is not indicated in the vocabulary.—In giving the etymology of *vieil*, the hypothetical form *VECULUM* is not mentioned.

The following errata have been noted:

Page xii, note, read 1 for 4.

- " 5, l. 19, " pedre for pedre.
- " 5, " 23, " qued for qued.
- " 14, " 7, " §§ 56, 57 for §§ 55, 56.
- " 17, " 2, " mots for mois.
- " 25, " 23, " emperedor for enperedor.
- " 50, " 10, " 219 for 220.
- " 61, " 8, " 762 " 772.
- " 65, v. 1, " e " et.
- " 85, (caption) read 1680-1850 for 1600-1850.
- " 114, insert as caption (Vers 3705-3733-).
- " 117, col. 2, l. 8, read 455 for 454.
- " 124, " 2, " 8, " 65 for 64.
- " 135, " 2, read fesistes for fesist.
- " 138, under (Hardement), read hardementz for hardement.
- " 151, " 4. Que, read qued for qued.
- " 157, " Tens " 416 for 116.
- " 158, " Umele " HÜMILEM for HÜ-MILEM.

E. L. RICHARDSON.

Leland Stanford Junior Univ.

A CONTESTED POINT IN THE INTERPRETATION OF TENNYSON'S "IN MEMORIAM."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The allusion in the first stanza of Tennyson's "In Memoriam"—I speak of the poem proper, not of the Prologue—has been the subject of prolonged controversy among

Tennyson students and interpreters, in both England and America. It has been frequently explained as having reference to a familiar passage in Longfellow's "Ladder of Saint Augustine," and it is interpreted in accordance with this somewhat arbitrary conjecture by Morley in his 'Library of English Literature,' under "Poems of Religion." The impossibility of reconciling with certainty the respective dates of composition should exclude this supposition as unsustained by rational proof, and unscientific in its mode of seeking for the truth.

The question has been definitely settled, however, by Lord Tennyson himself, who in a brief but explicit letter to the writer, dated November 3d, 1891, says that the allusion is to Goethe, and refers to one of his latest utterances,—'From changes to higher changes',—as the suggestion or inspiration of this renowned stanza which has become engrafted into the very consciousness of English speech.

In the most recent edition of Bartlett's 'Dictionary of Poetical Quotations,' the student will find Lord Tennyson's own comments upon the passage as expressed or conveyed to Dr. Gatty, the well-known author of a 'Key to In Memoriam.' The Poet Laureate regards the stanza in question as embodying and setting forth the very essence of Goethe's philosophic creed.

HENRY E. SHEPHERD.

College of Charleston.

INTRODUCTION TO PHONETICS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—There are a few points in Prof. Grandgent's very favourable review of my 'Introduction to Phonetics' in your February number, 1892, to which, with your permission, I should be glad to reply. The most important of these is the alleged stiffness of my English pronunciation, said to be "stiff almost to pedantry." Certainly, if I had not explained that I had judged it most convenient to use fixed forms for variable and weak words (p. 84), the pronunciation represented would be more than stiff, indeed quite impossible. It is only on p. 82 of Part ii, that I have given a specimen showing my pronunciation of weak and variable

words, but I hoped that I had guarded against misconception, for I have not only discussed these words pretty fully on pp. 76-85, but have expressly stated that

"To pronounce such (that is, weak) words always in their emphatic forms would be very strong and unnatural, and quite contrary to the genius of our language. In fact no Englishman could do it."

P. 78; see also p. 106. But as children and beginners in phonetics find it extremely difficult to analyse whole sentences and to write down correctly the weak forms of variable words (pp. 107 f.) I aimed at a style of writing which they could adopt without attempting this analysis, by simply spelling one word at a time.

In French such a method of spelling would be practicable, and Mr. Paul Passy is responsible for the French specimens. In like manner, Prof. Viator is answerable for the German, where he has introduced the glottal stops less regularly in the more colloquial passages.

That long 'æ' is often heard in English I cannot deny. Long wide 'ɔ,' as in *dog*, is also not infrequent, but I think that both are inelegant and ought to be avoided.

Prof. Grandgent concludes that because I pronounce *fairest* like *aorist*, there is a strong glide before the 'r' in both cases. On the contrary, there is no appreciable glide in either. See pp. 59, 60. And in the same way I pronounce simple 'ɔ' and not 'ɔə' before 'r' followed by a vowel, as in *story*. *Transition* I pronounce not with 'z,' but with 's.'

LAURA SOAMES.

Brighton, England.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—I would remind Miss Soames that I objected, not to any "alleged stiffness" in her own pronunciation, nor even to the "more than stiff" English of her texts, but to the discrepancy between her English and French systems of notation. I cannot see why the argument she adduces for English does not apply with equal force to the other language. However, I do not think it worth while to discuss at greater length what seems to me to be, at the worst, a slight blemish in an excellent book.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Rather extensive personal observation and the examination of a large number of catalogues for the studies pursued at different colleges, have led the writer to conclude that the study of the Romance languages and especially literatures, is much neglected if not lightly esteemed in many institutions. An investigation of the facts which should clearly set forth the condition (amount, character, etc., so far as possible) of the study of these idioms and the wider circulation of the same, would be interesting and instructive, and could not fail to do much toward correcting the want of appreciation in which these studies are held in certain parts of our country. It does not seem improbable that the chief cause of the wide-spread neglect of these subjects, is the result of ignorance of their real value as a means of discipline, and of the extent, wealth and charm of their literatures.

Students are often less to blame for their neglect of these subjects than are persons, who have the shaping of their courses of study before they reach the time when these idioms are taken up. A carefully prepared lecture by the professor of Romance languages, or some equally qualified person, giving general notions of the wealth of the Romance tongues and of the importance of the Latin races, might contribute to arouse an interest in students whose attention had not before been called to these studies. As one of the most reliable and helpful aids to a presentation of the subject in outline, will be found a series of books on 'Zeiten, Völker und Menschen,' von Karl Hillebrand (Strassburg, Verlag von Trübner). 'Frankreich und die Franzosen' is now before me, and has been found to be a mine of information and suggestion.

EUGENE W. MANNING.

De Pauw University.

BRIEF MENTION.

Part iv, Section i (*sār—swīðrian*) of the Bosworth-Toller 'Anglo-Saxon Dictionary' (Clarendon Press), just published, will disappoint students of Anglo-Saxon who have long

been looking for the completion of this work. Professor Toller had not prepared his public for a division of Part iv, and his silence on the point begets the unpleasant apprehension that the tattered parts, now extending over ten years, are not soon to be patched and glued into the desired whole. The low speed at which Professor Toller is proceeding in this work would be less annoying if the reason for it were more obvious. In the new pages the editor maintains his previous level of workmanship. The articles on the dem. *sē*, the verb *sculan*, the particle *swā*, and the pron. *self* are very full and of special value for syntax, while editorial skill is specially prominent in the classification of meanings under *scēawian*, *scēotan*, *sēcan*, *seccan*, *sellan*, *settan*, *slēan*, *standan*. Under *seolh*, *sulh* and *sūlung* the editor disregards the compensative lengthening of vowels (Sievers, §218). The peculiar use of *selfice* occurring 'Past.' 25, 7 is omitted, but excellent discrimination is shown in admitting the new theme *scofettan*.

An interesting and suggestive 12mo pamphlet of sixty pages has reached us, bearing the title "Modern Languages and Classics in America and Europe since 1880. Ten years' Progress of the New Learning." By A. F. Chamberlain, M.A., Fellow in Clark University, Worcester, Mass. The countries for which a general view of modern language work is here given, include the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Hungary, Germany, Norway and Sweden. For these the author marks the drift of sentiment expressed by scholars during the last decade on the relation of classical and modern language training. Liberal extracts are given from original documents, showing a wide range of reading and a bibliographical survey that must be of interest to the teacher, while the chronological order in which much of the material is presented will enable him to follow the trend of ideas as they have developed and been grouped about this, probably the most important, reform movement in the history of pedagogy of the nineteenth century. It is gratifying to note that the writer's heart is in the right place; the conclusion of his monograph brings us an expression of the following unbiased sentiment:

"These essays, in which an endeavour is made to indicate the present state of the world's thought on the question of the comparative merits of the ancient and the modern languages, are penned in no spirit of opposition to Greek."

PERSONAL.

Dr. Ewald Flügel, Privatdocent at the University of Leipsig, has been elected Professor of English Philology at the Leland Stanford Jr. University. Dr. Flügel is already well known to American Students of English as one of the editors of *Anglia* and of the *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, to which he has contributed many articles. He is also the author of a critical edition of Sir Philip Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella,' and 'Defense of Poesie' (Halle, 1889).

Mr. C. H. Grandgent, Director of Modern Languages in the Boston High and Latin Schools, has in press (Ginn & Co., N. Y.) a small work on 'German and English Sounds.'

Professor H. C. O. Huss (Princeton College) has in press annotated selections from Hugo's 'Les Misérables,' which are intended for advanced students in French. This editor is also preparing a collection of French idioms adapted to the use of lower grade students.

Frederic Spencer, M.A., Professor of Modern Languages in the University College of North Wales, has been appointed Examiner in the Mediæval and Modern Languages Tripos of Cambridge (England) University.

Prof. W. T. Hewett (Cornell University) is engaged on a volume of essays entitled 'University Life in the Middle Ages, and other Essays,' which will contain papers on the History of the University of Leiden; the House of Orange; University Administration; and the poets Goethe, Schiller and Lessing.

Professor Hugo Schuchardt (University of Graz, Austria) is engaged on a special work dealing with Negro English. In order to treat this subject as fully as possible, the author would esteem it a favor, if writers of newspaper articles (or other casual contributions to local journals) bearing on the material, would forward to him directly copies of said articles, or indicate the same through the columns of MOD. LANG. NOTES.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEN DEUTSCHEN UNTERRICHT. VOL. V, NO. 5.—Vogel, T., Wie erzielen wir bessere deutsche Aufsätze in den Oberklassen.—Hildebrand, R., Wie die Sprache altes Leben fortführt, vii.—Bechstein, R., Der Unartig-Teutscher Sprach-Verderber und seine beiden Ausgaben vom Jahre 1643.—Menge, K., Goethe und Wieland vor Napoleon in Erfurt und Weimar. Nach Talleyrands Memoiren.—Biedermann, W. Frh. von, Heidenrölein.—Burghauser, G., Zur Lehre vom 'zusammengezogenen' Satze.—Sprenger, R., Zum Urfaust.—NO. 6. Hildebrand, R., Zu Fausts Glaubensbekenntnis, dabei von einer bedeutsamen Eigenheit in Goethe's Denk- und Sprachweise.—Schmalz, J. H., Der deutsche Unterricht auf der v. badischen Direktorenconferenz.—Goepfert, E., Unser Haus und Heim im Lichte der Sprache und Kulturgeschichte.—Schaeffer, T., Stil und Stilübungen.—Klee, G., Drei Weidmannsbriebe aus dem vorigen Jahrhundert.—NO. 7. Hildebrand, R., Olymp und Himmel, dabei etwas von hohlen Bergen und vom Echo.—Graeber, F., Deutsche Aufsätze in Tertia.—Landmann, K., Richard Wagner als Nibelungendichter.—Hoffmann, P., Metrische Studien zu Schillers Jugenddramen.—Klinzel, K., Einführung in die Geschichte der deutschen Sprache.—Feist, S., Eine Art dramatischer Lektüre im deutschen Unterricht der unteren Klassen.—NO. 8. Hildebrand, R., Deutschland grammatisch, zur Geschichte seiner Form.—Koch, K., Zum deutschen Aufsatz in den unteren und mittleren Klassen.—Strobel, K., Etwas vom Lesen und Lesebuch in der Volksschule.—Franke, K., Wo und wie studiert man ausserhalb des Kollegs und der Studierstube Germanistik?—Maydorn, B., Gegen den Misbrauch des Apostrophs.—Schultz, F., Ferdinand, Albas, und Don Karlos, Philipps Sohn. Eine Aufsatzbesprechung.—Draheim, H., Zu Goethe und Schiller.—NO. 9. Hildebrand, R., Zum Wesen des Reims auch des Stabreims, dabei eine Berichtigung Scherers.—Gloebe, O., Zur Erklärung des Hasennamens Lampe.—Lyon, O., Goethe's Gespräche.—Sprenger, R., Bemerkungen zu den deutschen Volksliedern.—Gloebe, H., Wider die Chrie.—Zuern, L., Die Lektüre der Hamburgischen Dramaturgie Lessings in der Oberprima.—NO. 10. Hildebrand, R., Zur Metrik des Nibelungenliedes.—Nebe, A., Die Lehnwörter im deutschen Unterricht.—Speck, E., Zur Erklärung von Schillers Jungfrau von Orleans.—Cremer, W., Wanderungen und Wandlungen eines Volksliedes.—NO. 11. Lyon, O., Friedrich Zarneke.—Hildebrand, R., Vom umgelegten Rythmus.—Gloebe, O., Über Tiernamen im Volksmund und in der Dichtung.—Zerglebel, E. H., Zur Behandlung von Uhland's Gedicht 'Der blinde König'.—Branky, F., Die Präposition *entlang* mit dem Dative.—Kamp, H., Zwei Aufsatzthematata aus Emilia Galotti.—Loebell, R., Zum Kapitel: 'Goethe ein grosser Nehmer' (Goethe und Merck).—NO. 12. Hildebrand, R., Zu der sogenannten Inversion nach *und*.—Boesche, G., Zur Frage der Entlastung der Lehrer des Deutschen an höheren Lehranstalten.—Fauth, F., Die Notwendigkeit der Übung im lauten, freien und zusammenhängenden Lesen aus der Natur der Sprache erwiesen.—Wasserzieher, E., Eine stilistische Eigentümlichkeit Wilhelm Jordans.—Semler, C., Carlos in Goethes *Clavigo* und die

Weltanschauung der Neuzeit.—Biese, A., Die Naturlyrik Ludwig Uhlands und Eduard Mörikes.—Dietrich, R., Der deutsche Unterricht in der pädagogischen Presse des Jahres 1890.—Wuestenfeld, L., Iphigenia und Hamlet.

GERMANIA. VOL. XXXV, NO. 3.—Boehme, O., Die Übereinstimmung zwischen dem Wigaloistexte und den Lesarten der Handschriftengruppe Bb in Hartmanns Iwein.—Borinski, K., Zur Warnung.—Grimme, F., Die Schweizer Minnesänger.—Gloebe, O., Noch einmal zur Tristansage.—Bech, F., Lesefrüchte (Schluss).—NO. 4. Walther, P., Bruchstück einer Handschrift des Rolandsliedes.—Behaghel, O., Bruchstück des Parzival.—Euling, K., Mnd. geistliche Gedichte.—Bahlmann, P., Die Sprichwörter aus des Johannes Murnellius 'Pappa puerorum'.—Ehrismann, G., Zum Schlegel des Rüdiger von Hunthofen.—Sprenger, R., Zu Albers Tugdalous.—Grimme, E., Zum Leben Ulrichs von Lichtenstein.—Faber, M., Hans Rosenplüt ein Rothschild.—Dankoebler, E., Zum Satzbau bei Luther; Zu Gerhard von Minden.—Brenner, O., Zu Germania 34, 369.—Behaghel, O., Zum Lanzelet Ulrichs von Zazikoven.—Ehrismann, G., Bibliographische Übersicht der Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie im Jahre 1886 (Schluss).—VOL. XXXVI, NO. 1. Stiefel, A. L., Über die Quellen der Hans Sachs'schen Dramen.—Maurer, K., Über Ari Froßi und seine Schriften.—Bechstein, R., Ludwig Wirth, Die Oster- und Passionsspiele bis zum xvi. Jahrhundert.—Ehrismann, G., Bibliographische Übersicht der Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie im Jahre 1887.—NO. 2. Michels, V., Zur Beurtheilung von J. Grimms Ansicht über das grammatische Geschlecht.—Ehrismann, G., Ahd. *huzil-lutzel*.—Jellinek, M., Zur declination der ahd. Abstracta.—Hirt, Zur Metrik des as. und ahd. Alliterationsverses.—Roth, Deutschlateinische Gedichte aus der Zeit des dreissigjährigen Krieges.—Fraenkel, Bemerkungen zur Entwicklung des Grobianismus.—Sprenger, R., Zu Reineke Vos; zu Reinhart Fuchs.—Bartsch, A., Drei Akrosticha.—Kochler, R., Eine koptische Variante der Legende von Gregorius auf dem Steine.—Lohmeyer, E., Zu Germania xxxi, 325.—NO. 3. Behaghel, O., Zu Hans von Büchel.—Bartsch, A., Bruchstücke einer Handschrift der 'Königstochter' Hans des Büchelers.—Behaghel, O., Zu Wolframs Liedern.—Bechstein, R., K. Koppmann, Zu Walther.—Roth, F. W. E., Mittheilungen aus mhd. Handschriften.—Schmidt, R., Ein Bruchstück eines deutschen Cato; Alte Ergänzungen des Alphabets.—Buchwald, G., Eine Quaestio 'Quodlibetica' des Johann Fabri de Werdea aus dem Jahre 1502.—Hirt, H., Zur Metrik des as. und ahd. Alliterationsverses (Schluss).—Fraenkel, L., Zum Proteusmärchen und anderen wandernden Stoffen.—Socin, A., Zu den Schweizer Minnesängern.—Ehrismann, G., Drittes Paulinzeller Rennerbruchstück.—Behaghel, O., Zu Germania, xxxvi, 2.—Schmidt, L., Arminias und Siegfried.—Steiff, K., Nachtrag.—Grillenbeger, O., Zu R. Köhlers Abhandlung: 'Mich wundert, dass ich fröhlich bin.'—Ehrismann, G., Wer nicht weiss was rechte Lieb sei; Bibliographische Übersicht der Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie im Jahre 1887.